

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIV.

April, 1908.

No. 4

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS

BALTIMORE

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIV.

April, 1908.

No. 4

ST. THOMAS AND HIS PHILOSOPHY.*

Today, with the Church at large, we commemorate the anniversary of Thomas Aquinas as one of the saints of God. In its corporate capacity the University observes his feast with the ampler solemnities to do honor to the great Doctor of the Church, the Angel of the schools, the Patron of philosophy and theology.

To pronounce these titles is sufficiently to recall to this audience the mighty work which St. Thomas has achieved for the Church during his own age, and in the centuries which have since elapsed. It is not necessary, here, to repeat in detail how, through the mouth of Popes and Councils, by the suffrages of religious orders, academic institutions and the testimony of learned men, the Church has, by universal acclamation and formal decree, elected St. Thomas Aquinas to be the special patron of all who seek to acquire, to defend, and to diffuse the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

As patron of the schools, St. Thomas is proposed to us in a double aspect. He is our personal model; he is the teacher to whom we are to look for intellectual light and leading.

While we read his story as recorded by his contemporaries, and study those silent tomes in which his mind speaks to ours

*An address delivered in the Chapel of the Catholic University of America, on the feast of St. Thomas Aquinas, March 7, 1908.

across the gulf of six centuries, he rises before us, the flawless exemplar of those who would seek and serve that wisdom which reaches from end to end mightily, and ordereth all things sweetly.

We see a man of princely bearing; a noble forehead indicative of the spacious intellect within; and a countenance breathing sweetness and serenity. We see a student who, in the cause of truth, scorned delights and lived laborious days. Surveying the whole field of human knowledge he gathers from every quarter materials to build up the city of God. Loving and trusting truth, convinced that, because all truth is of God, no sound reason can contradict faith, he welcomes knowledge from whatever source it may come. With a power of vision strong enough to penetrate the mists of hereditary prejudice, he perceived that the philosophy of Aristotle, as a whole was the work of sound reason, and therefore might be enlisted in the service of faith. Strong in his devotion to rational truth, he did not hesitate to encounter the dominant traditional antipathy, which, invoking venerable names of the past, anathematized Aristotle as the enemy of Christ. Respectfully disregarding the unwarranted dogmatism of narrower minds,—with what results we know,—he incorporated the Peripatetic into Christian thought. Calm, fearless, imperturbable, he faces every adversary, with unreserved sincerity. He extenuates no difficulty; never employs the tricks of the sophist and the special pleader; never descends to denunciation as a substitute for argument. In short, St. Thomas Aquinas is the finished model of the first intellectual virtue that should shine conspicuous in the Christian scholar—intellectual honesty.

Learning puffeth up. But in St. Thomas the widest learning was associated with the liveliest charity, and charity is not puffed up. He was too noble, too great, too like the Master whom he loved so well, to be a prey to the pettiness of self-conceit, of jealousy, of rivalry, or the elation of triumph. Possessing all the science of the day, endowed with an irresistible logic which soon rendered him the acknowledged master of the academic arena, he was regarded by his contem-

poraries as an intellectual giant. But, while he possessed the giant's strength, he did not use it tyrannously as a giant. His biography offers many examples of the refined heart-born courtesy with which he treated his opponents. You search his writings in vain for even an echo of the *Impudentissime mentiris*, which, in every age, too frequently resounds through theological controversy. In him, there is none of the arrogance of superiority, none of the impatience of genius towards dullness, or severity towards conceited mediocrity. The *Quodlibeta*, a large volume of papers written by him on all sorts of topics, in answer to correspondents who consulted him, witnesses to the generosity and patience with which he placed his knowledge and time at the service of all. And, when we find in that collection of enquiries, a careful answer to such a question as, *Does a crusader who is returning from the Holy Land die a better death than one who is going thither*, we need no further testimony to convince us that Thomas merited the apostolic commendation bestowed on those who suffer fools gladly.

It were a theme for another occasion to speak of the piety of St. Thomas. Suffice it here to remember in passing, that, from first to last, he was in the eyes of his brethren, a model of all the evangelical virtues. Though he loved study and learning, he cared nought for intellectual power except so far as it promoted the interests of the Church of Christ. He lived in heights so serene that he seemed above the currents of earthly passions. "Animum," says his biographer, "nulla sensualis passio perturbabat, nullius rei premebat affectio temporalis."

In his day, the Temple was disturbed by the clamor of the money changers. Too frequently the gospel husbandman left the plough to rust idly in the furrow while he joined in the unholy race of which the prizes were gold and scarlet, and the broad phylacteries and salutations in the market place. But the heart of Thomas was set on incorruptible treasures. The son of a powerful house, the honored guest at the table of kings, the intellectual leader of Christendom, he early refused exalted clerical dignity; and from this decision no persuasion of pope or prince, of man or woman, could induce him to budge.

Brother Thomas he was; Brother Thomas he should remain; and the poor habit of St. Dominic was his only insignia during life, his honorable shroud in death.

Habitual consecration to abstract reasoning on the truths of religion is not conducive to piety. The professional theologian is seldom a contemplative. His business is less to feel compunction than to formulate its definition; while on the other hand, the mystic somewhat scornfully says: *Quid nobis de generibus et speciebus?* But in Thomas these two forms of knowledge seemed to blend. In the *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, the *Adoro Te Devote*, the *Tantum Ergo*, burning love expresses itself in the categories of metaphysics. It has been well said of him that, "The unalterable serenity of his intelligence, the profound calm of his heart, had made his soul the home of that truth which never dwells in perturbation and trouble. God himself seemed to condescend to this grand soul, and to furnish him with special assistance."

That perfect balance of mind, which is the conspicuous quality of his intellectual work pervades his spirituality. There is no Manichean exaggeration in his asceticism, no puritanical gloom in his piety. For him, human nature is not a deadly jungle of noxious plants and venomous reptiles, but a divinely planted garden of powers and affections awaiting only the rains of grace to bring forth flowers and fruits pleasing to God. In the soul of Thomas the human qualities which naturally inspire respect, admiration and love are so united with heroic virtue and supernatural gifts that he stands forth one of the most human, the most lovable, the most Christ-like of the Saints.

Let us turn from the saint to the doctor. The Holy Father has recently commended to us the philosophy of St. Thomas, not in terms of vague, conventional eulogy, but with an earnest, definite purpose. He directs that it is to be adhered to as the norm of teaching, in order to meet the special exigencies of the day. He warns us that the rationalism which is dominant outside the Church is seeking an entrance into the schools. He whose judgment is not to be disputed, and whose word is a law, commands that all teachers

and students shall ensure themselves against seduction by adhering faithfully to the Thomistic philosophy. This decision implies that the prevailing philosophy of error and the philosophy of St. Thomas are radically opposed to each other. Now, when such a fundamental antagonism exists between two systems of thought we may assume that they differ upon the postulates which are the starting point of speculation, and precede all argumentative development. There must be a declaration of war in the very attitudes which they assume as they confront each other across the problem of knowledge. This being the case, it would seem that the first step towards an intelligent execution of the Holy Father's instructions would be clearly to determine and define the exact ground of this irreconcilable opposition. What, we might ask, are the first principles, respectively, of contemporary rationalistic philosophy and scholasticism which encounter each other with a clash of yea and nay?

If we carry out such an investigation we shall find ourselves emphasizing an aspect of Thomistic doctrine which, on the whole, has scarcely received from ourselves the attention which it merits. We hear a great deal about St. Thomas as the defender of faith against the encroachments of reason; and comparatively little about the fact that he no less strenuously defends the legitimate claims of reason. In his grand synthesis of natural knowledge and supernatural revelation he assigns to reason the indispensable work of laying down, sure and firm, the road by which alone we may reach the heights where we are in the position to make an act of faith. That reason may successfully discharge this function, it must be credited with competence to acquire into itself a knowledge which is a faithful counterpart of actual being. Its judgments must be held to be true and certain; not merely within the province of transitory phenomena, but true beyond the range of sense and space and cosmic change, true absolutely and eternally. This recognition of the authority of reason is the fundamental affirmation of Thomistic philosophy.

On the other hand the denial of this primatial principle is the first article in the creed of that agnosticism, which, in

more or less definite form, and in varying proportions, is implicit in contemporary rationalistic thought. This creed holds truth to be, in the last analysis, nothing more than a harmony among ideas; while it resolves ideas into a scheme of symbols which, arising in consciousness, serve somehow or another as a working hypothesis for the adjustments of life; but, because they are mere phases of consciousness, can have no ulterior value or significance. The duel which has been in progress since the days of Descartes between rationalism and scholasticism continues with unabated vigor; but the combatants have exchanged rôles. St. Thomas is now the defender, and rationalistic agnosticism the traducer of reason.¹

Failure on the part of many Catholic writers to observe this fact and appreciate its dialectic import has led to a large waste of zeal in the making of many books. The apologist who overlooks it may, indeed, do good service in strengthening the faith of believers, but as far as the unbelievers, whom, presumably, he addresses, are concerned, he will remain but an unheeded voice crying in the wilderness with no efficiency towards preparing the way of the Lord. No; it is not the undue exaltation of reason, but the undue disparagement of reason, which is the original sin of present day philosophy. The ultimate distrust of reason's power to acquire certainty about anything beyond our own subjective states is the most radical and the most dynamic characteristic of educated unbelief.

Unsophisticated mankind takes for granted that it sees, feels and touches a world of things outside the mind. But idealism says to it: "You labor under a delusion. What you perceive is but your own subjective feelings—what you call things is

¹ Speaking of agnosticism, His Holiness Pius X says:—According to this teaching, human reason is confined entirely within the field of phenomena; that is to say, to things that are perceptible to the senses, and the manner in which they are perceptible. It has no right and no power to transgress these limits. Hence it is incapable of lifting itself up to God and of recognizing His existence, even by means of visible things. . . . Yet the Vatican Council has defined: 'If any one says that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason by means of the things that are made let him be anathema.' (De Revel., Can. 1). *Encyclical, Pascendi Gregis.*

such stuff as dreams are made of." "You are compelled, indeed," says the Kantian, "by the congenital limitations of your intellect, to think that two and two make four; but, I deny that what we necessarily think must necessarily be, or be as we think it. The world of things lies outside the reach of the human understanding, our knowledge is a domestic paper currency which serves as a medium of exchange within the realm of humanity, but is entirely worthless beyond it." The Spencerian declares that God is a word to which no definite idea can correspond in the mind of a philosopher. These doctrines are elaborated into systems. They are present, either bodily or in some diluted form in most of the characteristic thought of the day. Speculation loses itself in negation.

Pathologists tell us that some diseases first attack the surface tissues of the body, and then enter on a secondary and more malignant stage, in which the poison penetrates the vital organs and the bones. Rationalism has reached the secondary stage in which the virus of doubt is eating away the structural certitudes of reason itself. Religion is thereby deprived of all intellectual basis, without which it is mere æstheticism or personal caprice. This negation is all the more sinister because it does not issue in brutal atheism. By retaining the terms, religion and God, it commends itself to many souls that cannot extinguish in themselves the human hunger for the eternal. But the concession is quickly revoked; for, religion is made to begin where knowledge ends, and God is reduced to

"The guess of a worm in the dust,
And the shadow of its desire."

The work of destruction, once it is started, cannot be confined to religious beliefs. Agnostic rationalism in deference to society, would fain convince us that it leaves untouched the basis of morality. But, if all other truth is merely relative, without any assured objective value outside human consciousness, how can moral principles have any transcendent import or authority? If we cannot be certain that our intellectual knowledge is a genuine copy of objective being, then, for all we know, the moral law and duty may be nothing more than

evanescent states of mind. When you have thus resolved duty into a shadow projected by the mind, you cannot save the situation by bestowing on the spectre the high-sounding title of Categorical Imperative, or discoursing learnedly on animal heredity.

If this philosophy of negation were circulating only in the lecture room, or through academic treatises it might be confined to the few. But its influence is propagated in the market place, the workshop, the homes of the multitude through the medium of reviews, popular periodicals, attractive novels, and the newspaper. Hundreds incapable of grasping a philosophic argument adopt its conclusions. Other forces have coalesced with philosophy. Many Protestant Christians have lost their ancient faith in the Bible, which was their all; and losing that "they give up all truth and further inquiry, and think there is no such thing as certainty." Man is a social being; in the matter of belief he is almost gregarious. Large masses will ever acquiesce without inquiry in the customs, opinions, modes of thought that prevail in the society around them. For this reason the sceptical temper spreads through high and low, till the social atmosphere has become so charged with doubt that only robust faith can breathe it with impunity. The ruling tendency is, concerning the things of the soul, to doubt every belief and to believe every doubt.

The age is tormented with an intellectual unrest which expresses itself in a perpetual interrogation. The answer which is given to it by those to whom it looks for light is, again, an interrogation. *Quis ostendet nobis bona?* Who by searching shall find out God? Who knoweth if the spirit of the children of Adam ascends upwards, and if the spirit of the beast descends downwards? Is the end of the just and the wicked alike? Who knows? Is life a lofty destiny, big with eternal issues; or is it but a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing? Again, who knows?

Where this frame of mind prevails, the triumphs of doubt may be read in the progressive debasement of the moral standards in public and private life. When men lose the firm con-

viction of a judgment to come they are in a mood to listen to the voice of that desolate pessimism which disguises itself in the mask of the voluptuary.—“We are born of nothing, and after this we shall be as if we had not been. Come, therefore, let us enjoy the good things that are present. Let us crown ourselves with roses before they be withered. Let no meadow escape our riot; for this is our portion and this is our lot.”² Such is the philosophy of life which, to the alarm of serious men, irrespective of creed, is rapidly gaining in individual, social and national life. The onflowing tide, in one place, presses, imminent, against the breakwaters; while elsewhere it is silently submerging the unprotected land.

History does not encourage the hope that mere philosophy will prove effective to bring about a revival of faith. *Non per dialecticam placuit Domino salvum facere populum suum.* To the Greek who sought for wisdom Paul preached Christ crucified. It is not through logic but by the cross that the Church may hope to restore all things in Christ. Nevertheless, as Pius X. has told us, philosophy has a work to do of great importance. To the philosophy of negation and doubt we must oppose the philosophy of affirmation.³ Against those one-sided systems which would spin out of the facts of consciousness alone a solution of the entire universe we must urge that sane, broad, comprehensive method which, envisaging all reality, within us and without, holds fast to every strand of truth that it acquires; traces them through the warp and woof of the world; and when it perceives them to converge, as they all do at length, towards the Infinite, hands over the problem to Revelation and Faith.

If, personally, we aspire to serve the cause of truth in the domain of philosophy, we must gauge correctly the position of the adversary and as a preliminary step, make good against

² *Wisdom*, Chap. ii.

³ In the first place, with regard to studies, we will and ordain that scholastic philosophy be made the basis of the sacred sciences.—Encyclical, *Pascendi Gregis*.

And let it be clearly understood above all things that the scholastic philosophy we prescribe is that which the Angelic Doctor has bequeathed to us. *Ib.*

Further, let professors remember that they cannot set St. Thomas aside, even in metaphysical questions, without grave detriment. *Ib.*

his denial, the Thomistic trust in reason. In order to bring Thomistic arguments to bear they will usually require to be translated into contemporary modes of thought, and not unfrequently, some may, with advantage, be passed over. We must keep in view the counsel which St. Thomas himself gives us against the mistake of presenting reasonings devoid of cogency and thereby subjecting faith to the derision of the infidel.

When inculcating fidelity to St. Thomas, the Holy Father obviates an objection frequently leveled against scholasticism. If, he says, there are to be found in it any excessive subtleties, or conclusions lacking probability, or incompatible with the certain knowledge of later times, he has no intention of insisting on the retention of such matters.⁴

The scholastic principle that all our natural knowledge is drawn from our experience of man and nature awakes the expectation that progress in knowledge of the physical world cannot but tell on metaphysical speculation. Now science has made strides since the days of the Peripatetics. In physics, astronomy, biology Aristotle is no longer "the master of those who know." Since the days of St. Thomas, too, the human mind has made conquests as great in all the sciences that have for their object the traces which man has left in the past. The ancient world has risen from the dust of ages; a great deal of history, secular and ecclesiastical, has been rewritten. The sacred sciences have not stood still. The schoolboy of today smiles at the mention of the four elements and the incorruptible empyrean. The beginner in theology speaks, not of the Areopagite, but of the Pseudo-Dionysius; canonists have ceased to quote the Donation of Constantine; apologists do not silence the opponents of pontifical power with the Decretum of Gratian. Our moralists will not permit practice to be regulated by the opinion of St. Thomas regarding the precise day on which embryonic life is associated with the rational soul; and the Immaculate Conception is no longer a disputable question.

⁴If anything is met with among the scholastic doctors which may be regarded as an excess of subtlety, or is not compatible with the certain knowledge acquired in more recent times, or is destitute of probability, we have no desire whatever to propose that such matters be followed by present generations.—*Ib.*

Other truths which have not yet obtained admission into the philosophic and theological synthesis are loudly knocking at the door. They will gain entrance, just as the Aristotelian system, after being long reprobated, was, through the genius of St. Thomas, advanced to honor.

But all things have their times and seasons. There is a time to speak and a time to keep silence, a time of war and a time of peace. When the foe is pressing on the gates of the city the prudent commander will not open them even to a friend, lest, at the same time an enemy enter by force or in disguise. It would be intolerable that the rationalism of which we have spoken should insinuate itself into Catholic teaching. If sound scholarship has reached results that demand recognition, they will in due time receive recognition. Do you fear that delay may prove injurious? God will provide. Permit me to read from a famous book a passage worth reflection: "There is a time for everything and many a man desires a reformation of an abuse or the fuller development of a doctrine, or the adoption of a particular policy, but forgets to ask himself whether the right time for it is come; and knowing that there is no one who will be doing anything towards its accomplishment in his own lifetime unless he does it himself, he will not listen to the voice of authority, and he spoils a good work in his own century, in order that another man, as yet unborn, may not have the opportunity of bringing it happily to perfection in the next. He may seem to the world to be nothing else than a bold champion for the truth and a martyr to free opinion, when he is just one of those persons whom the competent authority ought to silence; and though the case may not fall within that subject matter in which that authority is infallible, or the formal conditions of the exercise of that gift may be wanting, it is clearly the duty of authority to act vigorously in the case. Yet its act will go down to posterity as an instance of tyrannical interference with private judgment, and of the silencing of a reformer, and of a base love of corruption or error; and it will show still less to advantage if the ruling power happens in its proceedings to evince any defect of prudence or consideration. And all those

who take the part of that ruling authority will be considered as time-servers, or indifferent to the cause of uprightness and truth; while, on the other hand, the said authority may be supported by a violent ultra-party, which exalts opinions into dogmas, and has it principally at heart to destroy every school of thought but its own.”⁵ Half a century has elapsed since these words were written; but they are the words of one who looked quite through the deeds of men; and they are not an irrelevancy today.

Why do ye fear, O men of little faith? There is no reason for dread, there is no reason for impatience. On the one side, no error can ever contaminate the doctrine once delivered to the saints; on the other, if any mere human opinions should have gathered around the incorruptible deposit, time which brought them to birth shall bring them to nought. Christ is in the ship, and, when He judges that the moment is come, will bid the waves be still.—For His mercy is confirmed upon us, and the truth of the Lord endureth for ever.

JAMES J. FOX,

⁵ Newman, *Apologia*, p. 259.

SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF LYING.¹

"I would fain learn to lie," said the fool to King Lear. And he tells us that Lear's daughter punished him when he spoke the truth, that Lear whipped him for lying and that sometimes he was whipped for holding his peace. Shakespeare epitomized a large chapter in the social and moral history of the human race in this dilemma of his masterly fool. Are there not many who, forbidden to lie are forced to do so; who commanded to tell the truth, are punished for their obedience. We all feel when the best in contemporaneous moral sense gets possession of us, that the practice of lying is much to be deplored. Yet, a brilliant writer stated recently, with apparent warrant, that the truthful person would be monstrous in society. Taking the world as it is—and as it is the only way that we know it—embarrassment is stronger than principle and feeling is more imperative than judgment. When therefore judgment and principle forbid a lie while embarrassment and feeling force one toward it, the situation is an actual menace to the telling of truth, as statistics might easily show. Thackeray observes that love and lying commenced with human history. Although brave struggles have always been made to secure to truthfulness its warranted supremacy in human intercourse,

¹ In speaking of the lie, it may be well to remind the reader that it is necessary to distinguish between the facts or processes of lying, and the moral judgment of it. All agents of moral and spiritual progress unite in condemning the lie as a menace to the social order and violation of fundamental moral law. The persistent toleration of lying in so many social circles, however, seems to indicate an indifference to its evil which is to be regretted. An effort is made in these pages to point out certain social traits which are related to the practice of lying. It is believed that if more attention were paid to them, truth-telling might be made easier, and some of the plausible attempts to excuse lying might be set aside. Those who are interested in the moral rather than the social aspect here treated, may find helpful Cardinal Newman's *Apologia* or the essay on Lying and Equivocation in Father Rickaby's *Political and Moral Essays* (Benziger, N. Y., 1902). See also Genicot, *Institutiones Theol. Moralis*, vol. I, n. 413 and Sabetti-Barrett, *Theologia Moralis* (1902), n. 310. Some of the thoughts contained in these articles were briefly referred to in the *Homiletic Monthly*, March, 1905.

there is not as much occasion for boasting of its victory, as we could wish. We always hope that truthtelling makes good headway but we half fear to examine facts lest we lose heart. One would like to believe Oscar Wilde's claim that love of truth is growing so rapidly that it threatens the destruction of literature. He makes a cynic's plea for lying in his "Decay of Lying" and advises that a primer be written on "When to Lie and How."

It is strange that the truest moral instinct of advanced and vigorous peoples demands insistently that we hold to truth in social intercourse while the practical sense of practical persons reveals serious doubt about the possibility or practicability of it. If the problem is approached from the standpoint of doctrine, the case against lying is strong, definite, and in profession, undoubtedly approved. If we approach it in the situations and processes of every day life with its amazing complexity of human relations and interests, our conclusions may not be so clear and our certainty may not be entirely undisturbed. If we study minds and dispositions of the multitude, personal and social traits of masses, and calculating the rôle for mercy, peace, self-defense and order that lying actually plays, together with the confusion, disturbance of standards, distress and pain that indiscriminate truthfulness would cause, we find that the problem is incredibly complex and that no one may dismiss it with a hasty word. We are unfortunately almost compelled to say that lying is an institution.

One may object in advance that there is exaggeration here: that no teacher asks that all the truth be told all of the time. This is allowed without question as a fact but it is not to the point. Effort is made not to state doctrine nor teach the discriminations which give to virtue both charm and power, but to catch merely sociological aspects of the problem; to call attention to the human as distinct from the doctrinal side and to suggest ways in which attention might be directed with the hope of making truthfulness less unpleasant and more easy. It is well not to study the lie apart from its concrete setting. It appears in a process; the process involves many permanent

features of human disposition. These throw much light on the problem.

Lying should not be as one writer called it, "an art, a science, a social pleasure." It should be made unnecessary. A man may be always chaste, always charitable; he may avoid profanity and vulgarity or dishonesty, and he is praised. Let him be strictly truthful and few will tolerate him. A sensible man will ask no reward for being truthful; he will ask only that he be not outlawed, feared, punished for it.

The definition of lie depends on the definition of truth. There are many views of truth and truthfulness. David Harum distinguishes gospel truth and jury truth. Charles Lamb writes about secondary or laic truth and clergy or oath truth. President Hadley of Yale in his vigorous and manly address at the last Yale commencement, mentioned physical, moral and verbal truthfulness as distinct features of the virtue. Thoreau says admirably "It takes two to tell the truth—one to speak and one to hear." Robert Louis Stevenson speaks in this commendable way, "To tell the truth . . . is not to state true facts but to convey a true impression." One should not withhold recognition from an anonymous French writer who in a little pamphlet on "The Lie" approaches the question in this practical and passionless manner. Given that it is never permitted to lie, and then that there are cases where one may, even must, speak contrary to the truth with the intention of leading one into error, find a definition of lie which cannot be applied to any of these cases. Ruskin preferred to make the definition of truthfulness turn on "Unwillingness to deceive rather than in not deceiving," "A fond observance of truth up to the possible point."

Accurate as is, from one standpoint, the moral sense concerning truthfulness, strong and clear as is Biblical teaching, stern as have been at all times, pulpit and rostrum against lying, the people in their deeper heart appear to have been only half convinced. Life situations, embarrassments, conflicts of interest, ever real and pressing, have discounted the doctrine greatly for purposes of every day intercourse. In fact, the popular attitude toward the truth, is itself, not a truthful one.

Few might care to tell the whole truth about lying, but many do not hesitate, as one facetious individual did not, "to lie in the interests of truth." "Who has not loved a pleasant large-souled liar" asks a recent writer in *Scribner's*. Society eases its condemnation of alleged necessary lying by resort to euphemy. We speak of "fibs," "white lies," "stories." In biography we do not call men liars. Some such pleasant and softened circumlocution is used as that employed by one writer on Shelley. "He was not incapable of conscious fibbing." Johnson somewhere speaks of "the coarseness of truth" and elsewhere of "the meanness of falsehood" but he points no way out of the dilemma. A member of a well known New York Sunday School class is reported as having thought out a verbal loophole of escape when he said that a physician's lie to his patient is "permissible though wrong."

A venerable United States Senator, when examining a witness some years ago said to him: "It is always wise to tell the truth" thereby expressing good doctrine, but he added "if you can" and recognized the general doubt about the possibility of it. President Hadley in the address referred to was conscious of the same difficulty when he said: "What sort of unselfish considerations there may be which in extreme instances justify a man in departing from verbal truthfulness, I do not care to discuss. We all recognize that no man is worthy of our tolerance who departs from the truth for selfish reasons or who habitually neglects it for any reasons whatever." This remark occurs in an address given over to a most direct and manly appeal for truthfulness in all affairs of life. It was probably such a thought concerning the inevitableness and facility of some lying that led a quaint old Italian commentator quoted by Father Faber to say consolingly: "God made lying to be but a venial sin in order to destroy its empire and degrade its power and because of the facility of the sin and in contempt of Satan's craft." A Hindu epic tells us that Kausika was sent to hell for speaking truth when he should have lied to save a life. Although among Hindus, lying was condemned as the greatest sin, exception was made in favor of lying in certain cases.

If we suppose that a straightforward person, instructed in the doctrine against lying and sympathetically fond of truth telling, goes forth into the world and attempts to tell the truth as occasion demands, it is not difficult to discover that society will not permit him to go far. If he be a man of real gentle skill, a man of great power and fearless mind, a man of retired life and simple social relations, he may succeed in meeting the problem. But the average man or woman often cannot; so to borrow Molière's phrase we make our virtue pliant and then it meets the situation. If we are flagrantly truthful as the *Misanthrope* was, we become so unyielding, so rigid that nearly every situation in life jars on the nerves, and a fate no better than that of *Alceste* awaits us. The truth-teller discovers that we have been taught the obligation to tell the truth but we have not been taught the duty of loving it. We have been taught not to lie but we have not been taught, not to force others to lie. Truth will not be told in a civilization which resents it. Love of it, at least respect for it, is a first sociological requisite for its expression. If we develop then a definite and stern law holding men to the truth and at the same time build up a race psychology, a combination of traits which lead men to resent, punish, denounce and condemn truth telling even where it is called for, we blunt the moral sense and actually produce the situation which confronts us to-day. Father Faber describes it in this merciless way: "Diplomacy of manner, way and speech, circuitous routes for courtesy's sake, giving things wrong names, and being silent when silence is really speech." "Lie, affectation, pretence, forced sympathies, unreal excitements, imaginary interests, hypocritical enthusiasms, fashionable likings and dislikings, contagious imitations and a whole significant world of conventional conversation which has not the meaning the language grammatically only would convey—these are, the component parts of daily well-mannered intercourse." How is one short of martyrdom or exile to be truthful in such a situation?

This onesided moral development in which men have been taught to tell the truth but have not been taught to welcome it, bears very directly on many of the virtues, and causes con-

fusion. Thus society insists that we be kind; all culture demands it; yet taking men as they are, one of average character must lie in order to be kind. Culture and the spirit of Christianity demand that we be not cruel, but also that we be truthful. Yet, taking men as they are, to be truthful is to be cruel. The happy synthesis of all pertinent virtues, so necessary to give the charm to character which is the noblest attraction of man, is made practically impossible because of these settled disturbing traits in the dispositions of men. Life is full of impossible situations and delayed moral salutations and the outcome is a harvest of lies. This is becoming more evident and maybe more necessary as life becomes more and more socialized. Others touch us at a thousand places. Lives are interwoven; feelings cross one another at every point; we are associated in business with men whom socially we dislike, and with men socially whom morally we condemn, and with men morally, whom we intellectually cannot tolerate. All types and kinds of disposition are pitched together into the one association, and either interests or culture or circumstances force us to the apparent acquiescence in external courtesy which makes life possible. To try to hold to primary truthfulness in the midst of this complexity and confusion involves greatest strength and to do it successfully implies tact of a high order. It is easy to believe with sociologists that lying seems to develop as life becomes more complex and multifarious. One who never lies, never juggles words; one who is simple, direct, candid, yet always in good form; one who never causes pain by truth-telling nor joy by falsehood; one who meets impudence without resentment, curiosity without insult, vanity without curtness and the average amiable weaknesses of human nature without failing in loyalty to truth, is in very fact, a noble man, and artist of the highest type.

II.

There are of course, many kinds of lies. On the whole it seems that condemnation of the cowardly lie and of the selfish and malicious lie is frank and universal. But the lie in what is otherwise legitimate self-defense, the lie to meet an emer-

gency, to accomplish a good of great magnitude, to save a life, to avoid giving acute pain—these are the kinds that harass society, because of their apparent necessity and of their wrongness, and because of the high character of many who resort to them when they cannot see the way to avoid them.

There are many who find no comfort in the tricks of words by which it is hoped to evade a difficult situation. Many find it more “honorable” to lie directly, than to evade or resort to reservations. This seems to have been an element in the Greek mind referred to in this way by Ruskin.

“The more essential difference between noble and ignoble lying in the Greek mind, was that the honorable lie—or, if we may use the strange yet just expression, the true lie—knew and confessed itself for such—was ready to take the full responsibility of what it did. As the sword answered for its blow, so the lie for its snare. But what the Greeks hated with all their heart, was the false lie; the lie that did not know itself, feared to confess itself, which slunk to its aim under the cloak of truth, and sought to do a liar’s work and yet not take a liar’s pay, excusing itself to the conscience by quibble and quirk.”

It is not easy to understand the lie if we take it as an act of mere individual morality. It is a social phenomenon. Very often if not always, it is the outcome of a definite social process and a response to a well-defined social pressure. This is illustrated by generalizations which are so often made concerning the relations of races or epochs to lying and truth telling.

St. Paul tells us that the Cretans are always liars. History shows how contact of one people with another affects directly the truth telling habits of both, as at one time between Greeks and Romans. Much of the lying of tribes of India is traced to contact with Europeans. Veblin in his study of the Leisure Class expresses the general thought that truthfulness is an archaic trait surviving from a peaceful culture just as untruthfulness is found in the predatory culture of a competitive epoch.

Macaulay long since paid his compliments to Asiatic mendacity, and to the constitutional inability of Bengalese to tell the truth. Yet their neighbors, according to Spencer, were wonderfully truthful. Among primitive races of India truth-

fulness seems to have been organic. The Santals are "a most truthful set of men." The Sowrahs "do not know how to tell a lie." The Bodo and Dhimals are "truthful in deed and word." Among Fijians, on the other hand, lying is honorable. In Dahomy we find wholesale lying. A speaker in the House of Representatives said, not long since, that "unblushing lying is so universal among the Japanese as to be one of the leading national traits." And a recent novel has this to say of the Arabs: "Truth telling among Arabs becomes a dire necessity to Europeans. One cannot outlie them, and it does not pay to run second to Orientals. So one learns with tears to be sincere."

While English-speaking people lay claim to the virtue of truth telling, the old English custom of Compurgation by which a man in court, produced many neighbors who swore that they believed that the individual in question was truthful, would seem to show that individuals were not much trusted to tell the truth when their interests were involved. Some seem to think that southern people are more inclined to lying than their northern neighbors; that strong races are truth tellers and the weak races are liars; that conquerors are truthful and slaves are liars; that we find more veracity with individualism and more demand for lying when men are highly socialized, and civilization is complex. A Mexican legend credits the Hassayampa river with such magic, that drinking one drop of the water totally destroys one's power to tell the truth. A recent story credits all the water in the rivers, branches, springs, wells, ponds, lakes, and irrigation ditches of Mexico with the same property and thus allows one to make most unpleasant inferences concerning veracity among Mexicans.

A frank review of certain phases of our own contemporary life will not leave the lover of truth undisturbed. Spencer compares us to many lower tribes, greatly to our disadvantage, in matters of truth telling. The impression among judges and lawyers concerning the lies even under oath met with every day in court, the whole range, spirit and method of advertising, the actual lies associated with buying and selling, permit the inference that we have specimens of all kinds of lies and liars

in such quantity and quality as to warrant an inductive study. From Tennyson in *Maud* we have the phrase: "only not all men lie." The Annanias Club might easily extend its unofficial membership. But who is to blame? The Liars? Only in part. In bulk these lies are social phenomena, referable in some way to definite situations, appearing as effects in obedience to social laws. It is too much to expect truth telling to develop more highly than truth loving, except in times when the passion for martyrdom is strong.

III.

It is to be inferred then that in some ways lying is a race phenomenon; that industrial and political organization, culture standards, spirit, degree of socialization, dealings of authority with individuals, environment, international relations, do actually play their part in the development of the race's psychology and specifically in its lying or truth telling. The lie is the weapon of the weak against the strong. Where weakness and strength meet in any form of antagonism, there the lie may be expected.

If it takes two to speak the truth, as Thoreau said, may it not usually require two to tell a lie,—one to make it necessary, and another to tell it. And shall we concentrate all our odium on the latter and leave the former to his pernicious activity, in compelling persons to lie? Shall we blame to malice what is due to confusion in the liar, who is often the much suffering victim, or blame to defect of character what is due to defective education? Shall we assume that the lie is of choice when it is the thoughtless coercion of others that drives one to resort to it.

Aside from being a race phenomenon, the attitude toward truth is a question of class psychology, of conflict between culture standards and the moral code; of individual psychology, and even of the very organic attitudes which the individual inherits from the society of which he is part. Hence to base the moral law concerning truth telling on the mere nature of words is to miss the whole point. To enforce a moral obligation of truth telling, without a coördinate duty to listen to and wel-

come the truth; to impute all guilt to one—a victim, and none to another—the cause, is to imperil truth itself and injure the moral sense, a condition that is in every way a moral calamity. May not some of our attention be directed toward or against the social traits that make lying necessary? A study of these will be offered in an article to follow.

WM. J. KERBY.

HAZLITT AS A CRITIC.

William Hazlitt, 1778-1830, was an ethical philosopher, a political writer, an economic essayist, an historian, a theatrical critic, a painter and a critic of paintings, an essayist upon men and manners, and a literary critic both as an essayist and as a lecturer. It is only by giving a list of his works—and it would be a long one—that we could convey a just conception of their number and variety. He used to say, himself, "I am nothing if not critical;" and it is his literary criticisms that we purpose here to consider, and his other writings and his life only as they illustrate his criticism.

Hazlitt cannot be pronounced to have been either a wise, or a virtuous, or an amiable man; his conduct was marked by a spontaneous contrariness that rose to every occasion; but like many another man who has made himself, and others, miserable about trifles, he bore a severe illness with patience; and he said, on the day of his death, "Well, I have had a happy life." He did not always nor often remember that spirits are not finely touched but for fine issues; yet it is no more than justice to say that he had a strong and keen understanding, a hearty relish for the beauties of literature, nature and art, and a generous ambition to win an honourable place in the ranks of men of letters. Coleridge, in that severe and dignified castigation which he administered for Hazlitt's "rhapsody of predetermined insult" against his first "Lay Sermon" (On the Bible as a guide to Statesmen) says: "And under the single condition that he should have written what he himself really thought, and have criticized the work as he would have done had its author been indifferent to him, I should have chosen that man, myself, both from the vigour and the originality of his mind, and from his particular acuteness in speculative reasoning, before all others."¹ Lamb,

¹ See the *Biographia Literaria*, ch. xxiv. (Harper's edition, vol. 3. p. 588.)

while calmly and loftily rebuking his suspiciousness, quarrelsomeness, and spite, declared that Hazlitt "in his natural and healthy state" was "one of the finest and wisest spirits breathing," and that he thought he himself should go to his grave "without finding such another companion."²

Hazlitt's earliest idol in literature was Rousseau, and he tells us himself that he spent "two whole years" of his youth, "the happiest years of my life," in reading and in "shedding tears over" the *Confessions* and the *New Eloise*. In later years, he lost his relish for the *New Eloise*, and was "very much mortified by my change of taste;" but he never wearied of the *Confessions*.³ It was a calamity for the young man that such reading should have fallen in his way. Nothing could have been more adapted to confirm all the morbid tendencies of his disposition. For Hazlitt had a mind akin to that of Rousseau, self-conscious, sensitive, craving for recognition, suspicious of slights, oscillating from ardent and extravagant admiration and attachment into bitter aversion, and in general expecting "finer bread than is made of wheat." He learned sense enough, in later life, to wish that he had "never read the 'Emilius,' or had read it with less implicit faith,"⁴ because it encouraged him in taking want of manners for a virtue—a mistake to which (as Matthew Arnold remarks) the sect and class in which Hazlitt was born are sufficiently prone. But this was the only point in which he acknowledged the influence of Rousseau to have been pernicious; and his indignation against Moore for his censure upon Rousseau in the "Rhymes on the Road" may be seen in

² See Lamb's open *Letter to Robert Southey, Esq.*, in the *London Magazine*, Oct., 1823; altered afterwards into an essay entitled *The Tombs in the Abbey*, and published in the second series of *Elia's Essays*. The original is given in Routledge's *Lamb* (edited by Ch. Kent.)

³ For Hazlitt's feelings about Rousseau, see *The Round Table*, on The Character of Rousseau (Essay XXI); and *The Plain Speaker*, on Reading Old Books. When Hazlitt in the essay on The Character of Rousseau classes Wordsworth with Rousseau, this is only dishonest and impudent hostility to the poet; and when he says that Rousseau, Wordsworth, and Benvenuto Cellini are the three greatest egotists, and "we defy the world to furnish a fourth," he has tongue in his cheek; for he well knew what "the world" thought of himself.

⁴ On Reading Old Books (in *The Plain Speaker*.)

the essay on *The Jealousy and Spleen of Party*.⁵ All this egoistic sentimentality was corroborated when he began to read German literature: "How eagerly I slaked my thirst of German sentiment, 'as the hart that panteth for the water-springs;' how I bathed, and revelled, and added my flood of tears to Goethe's *Sorrows of Werther* and to Schiller's *Robbers*."⁶

In literary style. Hazlitt's first model was Junius.⁷ It may be supposed that he was attracted as much by the political spirit and stern malevolence as by the artificial concentration and polish of that very unequal writer. Junius, indeed, though bitterly hostile to the Court, was no Radical like Hazlitt's friends, but an old Whig of the most rigid type. But it is the most ordinary of political fallacies to mistake a common enmity for a mutual friendship. If, in a theoretical question, the thought were to occur that two things, because they differ from a third, agree with one another, the absurdity would be apparent; but in practical affairs even highly intelligent people are prone to assume that the opponent of what they oppose is therefore the friend of what they would promote. There are fairly decent people who from mere hatred of the Papacy, or of religious persecution, honor such a man as Giordano Bruno; there are historians, who from mere hatred of republicanism, admire Cæsar; as there are politicians who, from hatred of something or other, admire Cromwell. And this same fallacy beset Hazlitt in the last years of his life, when, from indignation at the restoration of the French monarchy, he fell into a fixed determination to defend the military despot who had trampled out the French republic, and who had tried to convert his own autocracy into an hereditary monarchy, as well as to destroy the independence of all surrounding nations. And in a similar way he adds to the praise of Pope, in order to oppose other critics.

In spite of the attractions of Junius for the young political zealot, Hazlitt's admiration for his style waned and at last died

⁵ In *The Plain Speaker*.

⁶ On Reading Old Books, *ibid.*

⁷ If any further proof be needed that Junius was Philip Francis, it may be found in the fact that, while the Letters were appearing, Francis systematically directed suspicion against Burke.

out when he fell under the influence of a far greater master of English composition. One day in his eighteenth year he read in a newspaper some extracts from the *Letter to a Noble Lord*—Burke's *Apologia pro Vita Sua*; and he said to himself: "This is true eloquence; this is a man pouring out his mind upon paper." From that hour he never ceased to delight in the writings of the great orator. His political antipathy, his exasperation against the principles of Burke, became at one time so acrid that he seems to have persuaded himself—he certainly tried to persuade others—that Burke had opposed the French Revolution, because he was jealous of Rousseau and because his vanity was wounded when the framers of the French constitution did not consult him. But even then Hazlitt's mind could not become insensible to the charm of Burke's style. "It has always appeared to me," he says, "that the most perfect prose style, the most powerful, the most dazzling, the most daring, that which went nearest to the verge of poetry and yet never fell over, was Burke's."⁸ Hostile to the statesman as he was, hostile to monarchy as he was, he never grew weary of the magnificent passage in which Burke compares the British monarchy with the Parliament and the National Church, to "the proud Keep of Windsor, rising in the majesty of proportion and girt with the double belt of its kindred and coeval towers." "I never pass Windsor, but I think of this passage in Burke, and I hardly know to which I am indebted most for enriching my moral sense,—that, or the fine stanza of Gray beginning:

"From Windsor's heights, the expanse below
Of mead, of lawn, of wood, survey, etc."

"If such is my admiration of this man's misapplied powers," he says elsewhere, "what must it have been when I myself was in vain trying, year after year, to write a single essay, nay, a single page or sentence; when I regarded the wonders of his pen with the longing eyes of one who was dumb and a changeling."

⁸ On the Prose Style of Poets (in *The Plain Speaker*.)

"Junius's style with all his terseness shrunk up into little antithetic points and well-trimmed sentences."⁹

The sweep of Burke's eloquence, indeed, was altogether beyond Hazlitt's imitation. He has neither the sustained strength of passion nor the continuity and train of reflections requisite to support such a style as that. But it cannot be doubted that his own composition derived great benefit from this worship of Burke's eloquence. If Burke only delivered him from Junius, that alone would have been a great advantage. For, there is one thing which no one could learn from Junius, and which any one may learn from Burke; and that is, to be natural, to be oneself. Such as Hazlitt's style is, it is his own. And a very good style, in truth, it is. The diction is pure; the construction is clear; the march of the sentences is unconstrained, rapid, and energetic; the flow of the language is musical; and occasionally, he rises into fervid eloquence. The writer whose manner he most reminds us of, is Macaulay. But in this case there was no possibility of imitation on the part of Hazlitt, and if Macaulay learned his style from Hazlitt, the disciple in his passion for perfection carried the art further than his master.

If Burke was the writer whose prose composition Hazlitt most admired, the teacher from whom he learned most was Coleridge; the only man, in fact, from whom Hazlitt would admit that he had ever learned anything. It was in 1798, when Hazlitt was completing his nineteenth year, that he made the acquaintance of the poet. That was Coleridge's *annus mirabilis*; he was then in the zenith of his poetic power, and of his disposition to use it; it was then that he composed the *Ancient Mariner* and the first part of the *Christabel* and the *Kubla Khan*. He came to Shrewsbury in January, to try how he should suit the Unitarians there as a preacher; and Hazlitt, who lived at the town of Wem (in Shropshire) heard of his arrival. "A poet and a philosopher getting up in an Unitarian

⁹On Reading Old Books (in *The Plain Speaker*). It is a pity that Hazlitt's preference of Burke to Junius could not have been made known to Philip Francis, who after reading the *Reflections* on the French Revolution, wrote to Burke: "Once for all, I wish you would let me teach you to write English."

pulpit to preach," says Hazlitt, "was a romance which was not to be resisted," and the enthusiastic youth rose before daylight to walk ten miles over a muddy road on a winter's morning to hear Coleridge; and as the preacher gave out the text in his deep, musical voice, "it seemed to me, who was then young, as if the sounds had echoed from the bottom of the human heart, and as if that prayer might have floated in solemn silence through the universe. . . . (The Sermon) was even beyond my hopes. Poetry and philosophy had met together, under the eye and with the sanction of Religion. I could not have been more delighted if I had heard the music of the spheres." A few days later Coleridge came to visit Hazlitt's father (who was an Unitarian minister) according to the custom of that sect; and he paid the son the sweetest of all compliments, that of talking to him as an equal. Hazlitt was then, as he describes himself, "dumb, inarticulate, helpless, like a worm by the wayside;" and he had come into Coleridge's presence, shy, embarrassed, "half-hoping, half-afraid." Under the influence of Coleridge's genial companionship and friendly interest his whole nature opened out like a flower in the sunshine. When Coleridge was returning to Shrewsbury, Hazlitt walked part of the way with him, in a dream of delight and hope; and when Coleridge, three weeks later, was abandoning the Unitarian ministry to devote himself to literature and philosophy, and was leaving Shrewsbury, he invited Hazlitt to pay him a visit in the summer. The visit to Nether Stowey, in Somersetshire, duly followed, and he was admitted into the innermost circle of poetic genius, and introduced to Wordsworth and his bright, sympathetic, inspiring sister (a poet herself who wrote no poetry, "mute," but not "inglorious") who lived only three miles away, and who were constantly visiting or being visited by Coleridge. Hazlitt's actual mental condition may be seen from the incident, which he tells us himself, that one evening he "got into a metaphysical argument with Wordsworth while Coleridge was explaining the different notes of the nightingale to his sister."¹⁰ He had then

¹⁰ *My First Acquaintance with the Poets* (in *The Examiner*, 1817, and expanded and republished in *The Liberal*, 1823). The *Ancient Mariner* was finished before Hazlitt's visit, but Coleridge did not mention it to him.

read "but a few poets," and poetry "did not much hit my taste, for I am deficient in the faculty of imagination," but "from the commencement of my acquaintance with the authors of the *Lyrical Ballads*," he justly dates "my insight into the mysteries of poetry." There he spent three weeks, wandering through the glens of the Quantock Hills, or sitting and chatting "in an arbour made of bark, under two fine elm trees, and listening to the bees humming around us." That was the year in which the *Lyrical Ballads* (first volume) were completed and published; and he heard Coleridge recite, "with a sonorous musical voice, the ballad of *Betty Foy*," and Wordsworth read the story of *Peter Bell*:—"There is a *chaunt* in the recitation both of Coleridge and Wordsworth which acts as a spell on the hearers." Here, indeed, was the plain living and high thinking; it was like living in the city of Camelot, the city that is built not by hands but by music, 'and therefore never built at all and therefore built forever.' To any mind of the slightest sensibility such an experience must have been an initiation or baptism into a new life; but in contrast with the set gray life and mechanical round of the Puritan classes, it was like the third heaven. Even those who visited Coleridge were fed on honeydew and made to drink the milk of paradise. Three weeks of such companionship made it impossible for such a young man as Hazlitt, who had craved all his life for literary experiences and "thrills" as other boys long for adventures on the sea, or in the forest, or on the field of battle, ever again to sink back to the old level, any more than he who has seen a ghost, or a double, or a vision of the future or the distant, can be as if he had not seen; and Hazlitt conceived for the man who had lifted him out of his prosaic environment that reverence which is "dearer to true young hearts than their own praise."

In after years Coleridge's return to ecclesiastical and political conservatism led to argument, and arguments led to heated altercation, and this led to a quarrel; for Hazlitt would "sacrifice a friend to a theory;" and in a fit of ungovernable spite he wrote the devilish and bestial attack on the Christabel, in the *Edinburgh Review*,¹¹ and followed it up by criticisms, only one

¹¹ *Edinburgh Review*, Sept., 1816. Coleridge seems not to have known

degree less venomous, upon Coleridge's political writings; but this hostility was love to hatred turned, and sometimes a spark of the old feeling flamed up when he heard an attack upon Coleridge from some one else. Once, after one of Coleridge's lectures upon Hamlet, hearing some one say that the lecturer was believed to have got all his ideas upon Shakespeare from the Germans, Hazlitt burst out indignantly: "That is a *lie*! I myself heard those very ideas upon Hamlet from Coleridge before he had read or could read a page of German;" and he might have added, before the Germans from whom Coleridge was supposed to have stolen, had conceived those ideas; for this was in 1798, ten years before Schlegel's Lectures, and nine years before Schelling's theory of the Plastic Arts.

It is impossible to over-rate the effect of this early companionship upon Hazlitt. His critical principles and ideals were those of Coleridge. What Coleridge had said like a philosopher Hazlitt said like a man who writes for reviews and newspapers, with less depth and refinement of feeling, less amplitude of comprehension, less appeal to first principles, less subtlety of analysis, less richness of imagination, but with more perspicuity and energy. The difference between them is that which must always exist between the exoteric and the esoteric school, or between the man who can only criticise poetry, and the man who can also create it and feel it as it wells from his own soul. It is a difference in kind, not in degree. And Hazlitt, to do him justice, never denied that he was a disciple of Coleridge, though his acknowledgments are sometimes disfigured by an ungrace-

that this article was by Hazlitt. He did suspect Hazlitt, and rightly, of writing the attack on his *Lay Sermon* in the December number of that review. Mr. E. H. Coleridge in a note to a letter of Coleridge, dated Feb. 27, 1817, supposes wrongly that the poet, in speaking of "the last number" (*i. e.* the December number) is referring to the criticism upon the *Christabel*. It is a pity that Hazlitt's latest editor should have republished this; it is painful to think that any man should have thought, much less published, such things. It is only a very diseased imagination that could conceive such ideas. Apart from this case of deliberate, calumnious invention, the most unpleasant feature in Hazlitt's pleasantry is a certain "knowingness," a disposition to discover impurity in passages where no one else would perceive it, or where there is nothing but the plainness of earlier and perhaps healthier times.

ful egotism or by a disrespectful familiarity. "Coleridge was the first poet I ever knew. His genius at that time had angelic wings and fed on manna. . . . His thoughts did not seem to come from him with effort, but as if borne on the gusts of genius. He is the only person from whom I ever learned anything. There is only one thing that he could learn from me in return, but *that* he has not."¹² "O thou who didst lend me speech when I was dumb; to whom I owe it that I have not crept on my belly all the days of my life, like the serpent, but sometimes lift my forked head, or tread the empyrean,"¹³ such is the opening of an address which ends with insolent exhortations.

Hazlitt is an unequal writer; we cannot say of him, "His best he gave; his worst he kept." The need of a living has made men of letters publish many a fine thing that otherwise would only have been spoken in private; but it has often made a man publish what was scarcely worth speaking. We sometimes meet in Hazlitt the profoundest observations, dropped with careless ease, as when he says, to the objections against the representation of the love of Romeo and Juliet, "In all this, Shakespeare has but followed nature, which existed in his time as well as ours." And sometimes (though not often) he gives us such a platitude as the following: "Dryden's plays are better than Pope could have written; on the other hand, they are not so good as Shakespeare's." And sometimes, when he has a good thing to say, he wastes it because he has not the patience to keep it for a fitting occasion or a fitting subject. Thus, in his lecture on *The Living Poets*, a joke, which would be simply delightful if the butt were a man, is made unenjoyable by being thrown at a maiden lady, and one venerable for her advanced age as well as for her high character and active philanthropy, who can in no way have offended him except by holding the principles of the other party and by receiving a great deal of praise: "Mrs. Hannah More¹⁴ is another celebrated modern

¹² On the Living Poets, in the Lectures on the English Poets.

¹³ On Effeminacy of Character, in *Table Talk*.

¹⁴ It is scarcely necessary to point out that the title *Mrs.* was not then restricted to married ladies.

poetess, and I believe still alive" (as if *her* death might have occurred without notice); "she has written a great deal which I have never read." Why could not he have kept this jest for some of his male enemies, *e. g.* for Gifford? But if he sometimes misuses his wit in this fashion, at other times his sarcasm is employed with propriety and deadly skill; as, for example, when he remarks that Jeremy Bentham had been translated into French, "when it was the greatest pity in the world that he had not been translated into English;"¹⁵ or when he has a jest at the people "who live on their own estates and on other people's ideas;" who might, however, retort that this is better than to live, as so many men of letters have done, upon their own ideas and other people's estates. And often Hazlitt talks the language of manly sense and taste upon subjects where we are not used to it, and shows an independence of judgment and a superiority to convention that is rare in criticism. Thus he says of poetic descriptions of nature: "The best descriptive poetry is not, after all, to be found in our descriptive poets. There are set descriptions of flowers, for instance, in Thompson and Cowper and others; but none equal to those in *Lycidas* and in the *Winter's Tale*."¹⁶ And a similar habit of thinking for himself is seen in this judgment upon pastoral poetry: "We have few good Pastorals in our language. Our manners are not Arcadian; our climate is not an eternal spring. Perhaps the best pastoral in the language is that prose-poem, Walton's *Complete Angler*. . . . It is to be doubted whether Sannazarius's *Piscatory Eclogues* are equal to the scenes described by Walton on the banks of the river Lea. . . . Good cheer is not neglected in this work any more than in Homer or any other history that sets a proper value on the good things of this life." The like sound taste and good sense are displayed when, for instance, after enumerating the finest things in the *Fairy Queen*, he remarks: "But some people will say, that all this may be very fine, but

¹⁵ Let no one be misled by this joke into forgetting that it applies only to Bentham's later writings. His early compositions are models of clear and simple English, such as Goldsmith might use if he wrote upon Bentham's subjects.

¹⁶ See Act IV. Scene IV. Perdita's speeches.

they cannot understand it on account of the allegory. They are afraid of the allegory as if they thought it would bite them. . . . If they do not meddle with the allegory, the allegory will not meddle with them It might as well be pretended that we cannot see Poussin's pictures for the allegory, as that the allegory prevents us from understanding Spenser."

If Hazlitt has his wise and witty sayings, he has also passages of the purest pathos, as when in his lecture on Hamlet he says: "Ophelia is a character almost too exquisitely touching to be dwelt on. Oh rose of May! Oh flower too soon faded! Her love, her madness, her death, are described with the truest touches of tenderness and pathos. It is a character which nobody but Shakespeare could have drawn, and to the conception of which there is not even the smallest approach, except in some of the old romantic ballads." Or let us take the passage in which he speaks of the delight with which a youthful aspirant for fame, such as himself, first thinks that he too may be doing something worthy of praise: "Correggio's mind rejected by a natural process all that is discordant, coarse, and unpleasing. . . . He knew not what he did; and looked at each modest grace as it stole from the canvass with anxious delight and wonder. Ah! gracious God! not he alone! how many more in all time have looked at their works with the same feelings, not knowing but they too may have done something divine, immortal; and finding in that sole doubt ample amends for pining solitude, for want, neglect, and an untimely fate. Oh! for one hour of that uneasy rapture when the mind first thinks it has struck out something that may last forever! . . . Give back that heartfelt sigh with which the youthful enthusiast first weds immortality as his secret bride."¹⁷ This is a specimen of his eloquence when he is pouring out his feelings upon a subject in which he has a personal interest. Those who would see how eloquently he can write upon a subject of purely æsthetic interest, and where egoistic feeling does not enter, may turn to his lecture upon "Chaucer and Spenser," from which we extract a few sen-

¹⁷ See the essay, "Whether Genius is conscious of its powers," in *The Plain Speaker*.

tences: "Spenser takes us and lays us in the lap of a lovelier nature, by the sound of softer streams, among greener hills, and fairer valleys. . . . The love of beauty, however, not of truth, is the moving principle of his mind; and he is guided in his fantastic delineations by no rule but the impulse of an inexhaustible imagination. . . . He was the poet of our waking dreams, and he has invented not only a language but a music of his own for them. The undulations are infinite like those of the sea, but the effect is still the same,—lulling the senses into a deep oblivion of the jarring noises of the world, from which we have no wish ever to be recalled."

One of Hazlitt's most striking merits is his power of making a point clear, where critics differ. Thus, when it was disputed whether Pope is a poet, he remarks: "The question whether Pope was a poet has hardly yet been settled, and is hardly worth settling; for if he was not a great poet, he must have been a great prose-writer; that is, he was a great writer of some sort." The question, then, is not about the merits of Pope, but about the nature and idea of poetry.

With the theory of art for art's sake Hazlitt would have no sympathy. His judgments are eminently human. Whether right or wrong, in his criticisms he always is a man, and neither a pedant, nor a dilettante, nor even a pure critic, and thinks of life rather than art. The Lectures upon the Characters of Shakespeare's Plays are not a delineation of Shakespeare's genius, power, and art; and he has not tried to trace the development of Shakespeare's mind, or to expound his literary principles and methods. The characters are to Hazlitt almost historical characters; almost real men and women, whom he loves and hates as if they were his contemporaries; he has not always avoided the temptation to bring in his political philosophy; and the criticisms are sometimes veiled autobiography. It is noticeable that the characters which he best understands, and which he explains with most sympathy, are Timon and Coriolanus. Of the other dramatists of the Shakespearean age he knew little; he had not read one of them until he wanted to lecture upon them. Then he talked about them with Lamb, and borrowed volumes from Bryan Waller Procter, and went

down to a lonely old inn on Salisbury Plain, and secluded himself for six weeks to write the lectures upon the literature of the age of Elizabeth.

A passage in one of these lectures well illustrates his way of reading literature. In a play of Dekker's with an unpleasant name he met a character after his own heart:—"Old honest Dekker's Signor Orlando Friscobaldo I shall never forget. I became only of late acquainted with this worthy character; but the bargain between us is, I trust, for life." "Even here on Salisbury Plain, with a few old authors, I can get through the summer or the winter months without ever knowing what it is to feel *ennui*. . . . After a long walk through unfrequented tracts, I can 'take mine ease at mine inn,' beside the blazing hearth, and shake hands with Signor Orlando Friscobaldo, as the oldest acquaintance I have." Hazlitt can understand only what is like himself; and hence he is less qualified to expound the universal spirit of Shakespeare than the narrower though sublimer mind of Milton.

Though he could not keep his political philosophy out of the lectures upon Shakespeare, yet in general, when he is dealing with the past (and not with the living), he rises above the party, and he can censure those Dissenters who "will hint to you, as an additional proof of his genius, that Milton was a non-conformist, and will excuse the faults of the *Paradise Lost*, as Dr. Johnson magnified them, because the author was a republican."¹⁹ From patriotic prejudice, likewise, he was perfectly free. Indeed the only fault in his cosmopolitanism was that it was not complete; it did not go right around and end at home, where it had not begun. A cosmopolitan ought to include his own family within the circle of his affections; if he does not love his wife because she is his wife, he might at least love her as a member of the human race. It is to be feared that his cosmopolitanism was little better than what Spencer and Mill call "the bias of anti-patriotism." Hazlitt is truer and juster and shows more insight in his praise than in his blame; and this is so with all his criticisms, both literary and political. Unhappily, he is

¹⁹ On the Tendency of Sects, in *The Round Table*.

more given to censure than to admiration. He was the son of a Scotch-Irishman; but the stock, during its residence in Ireland, had not taken on any of the debonair qualities of the Celt.

All sections of his countrymen suffered from the rough side of his tongue; when he was not vilifying the English, he was attacking the Scotch; or if he was not quarreling with one or other of these, he was disparaging the Irish. He was one of those people who think that impartial vituperation is the same thing as justice. This censorious temper is the consequence of Protestantism, especially in its Calvinistic form; and when Hazlitt travelled, and got into Catholic society, he at once perceived this:—"As to manners, the Catholics must be allowed to carry it, all over the world. The better sort not only say nothing to give pain; they say nothing of others that it would give them pain to hear repeated."²⁰ He was then too old to change his ways; and, as Wilson said, "If you want Hazlitt's praise you must die for it;" he added with equal truth, "It is almost worth dying for." It was the spirit of contradiction that led him astray. He was hostile to Coleridge and to Wordsworth because they in mature manhood rejoined the other side; and to Scott because he had always been on the other side; he detested the Whigs because they held that the essence of government is compromise; and the Radicals because they were utilitarian and indifferent to literature and fine art; he censured Moore for saying, in reference to Rousseau, that genius is no substitute for morality; and he attacked the genius of Shelley, who was neither a Tory nor a Whig nor a unitarian nor a moralist, but in religion and politics and morals as radical as anyone well could be, and at the same time one of the truest poets of any age. If Hazlitt's family had settled in this country,²¹ he in all probability would have been anti-democratic, and his writings would have been such as to convey to the Old World the notion that American government consists only of "bosses" and "machines." What he most lacks is humour and good humour, both in his life and in his writings. A

²⁰ See the essay entitled *Hot and Cold*, in *The Plain Speaker*.

²¹ The family spent some years here, and the father is said to have been the founder of the first Unitarian Church in Boston.

married man, and in his forty-fourth year, he fell into an infatuation such as in a superstitious age would have been ascribed to some magical spell or philtre, or to some fairy's trick such as Oberon played upon Titania. His goddess was the daughter of his lodging-house keeper, a girl without intelligence enough to understand his fine sentiments, and whose studied silence he imagined to cover thoughts lying too deep for words. When he discovered that she had a lover of her own class, and was laughing in her sleeve, he had not sense enough to be ashamed of his folly, nor sufficient perception of the ridiculous to refrain from seeking sympathy from acquaintances who could scarcely keep their countenances. He actually appealed to the public in a *Liber Amoris*, in which only the names are withheld; and he returns again and again to the subject in his writings, as a justification for his misanthropy. Misanthropy, however, when not decorated with Byronic eloquence and versification, is not very interesting. It is this deficiency in humour that accounts for most of the faults of his writings. And he has not the true artist's self-restraint and sense of measure. Whatever is in comes out:—"I say what I think, and I think what I feel."

Yet he is an important figure in the literary criticism of that age in which English poetry was renewing its youth like the eagle, and when it was producing types so distinct as Blake²² (the morning star of the new creation) and Wordsworth, and Coleridge, and Scott, and Southey,²³ and Moore, and Byron, and Shelley, and Keats. If he gave little direct encouragement to contemporary genius, he at least upheld standards of criticism which favored them, and he indirectly assisted them by contributing to revive the study of the whole literature of the Shakespearean age. If he had not De Quincey's eloquence, nor Coleridge's philosophic comprehension, nor Lamb's

²² Blake, long strangely ignored, is at last coming into his own; but it is to be hoped that some of his critics will not persist in their ridiculous attempt to get us to take a poet for a seer and prophet.

²³ It ought to be superfluous to say that Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey do not form one poetic school, any more than Spenser and Milton (for example) do.

delicacy of feeling, nor Leigh Hunt's lightness of touch, yet he is a man of vigorous, penetrating, independent intellect; such a critic as Johnson might have been, if he had lived in a better age, and if he had enjoyed the company, while his own mind was forming, of such minds as Coleridge and Wordsworth. We may love or we may dislike Hazlitt, but we cannot ignore him or be indifferent; and there are many signs that he is now on the eve of a great revival.

M. J. RYAN,

ST. BERNARD'S SEMINARY,
ROCHESTER, N. Y.

NOTES ON EDUCATION.

- Query 1. Should children who have not passed the required examinations be allowed to pass up with their companions into the next grade?*
- Query 2. Is it advisable to have dull pupils remain two or three years in the same grade while the younger pupils pass ahead of them? Do the dull pupils really gain much by repeating the work under such circumstances?*
- Query 3. What means would you suggest to interest in their studies pupils who have long been accustomed to habits of indolence and carelessness?*
- Query 4. Is it the fault of our system of education or of our methods of teaching that so many boys of from twelve to fifteen years of age seem to become disgusted with school and long to go to work? What remedy would you suggest?*

Queries such as the above have reached me in large numbers from all parts of the country. In fact, there is scarcely a school in the land, whether parochial or public, in which earnest teachers are not asking similar questions. The dull and backward pupil is not a local product and the number of boys at the age of twelve or fifteen who would rather work than go to school is very large. Some of these, of course, seek employment because of the financial compensation attached or because of the greater freedom which they hope to enjoy, but after due allowance is made for all this, the number of boys who leave school at this age because their interest in school work has disappeared and because they are disgusted with the school is amazingly large. This state of affairs naturally raises the question of whether the school itself is not to blame. If it were merely the teacher who was at fault, the condition would not be so universal. It looks as though the system itself were out of adjustment with present conditions and with the life of our day.

If the dull pupil is advanced with his class he will soon be carried beyond his ability and will pass through the exercises without comprehension. And on the other hand, if he is condemned to repeat the work of the grade with a set of younger children, the results will be even worse. The matter of the whole year's work has been spoiled for him, it has lost its freshness and its interest, and at every hour of the day he is reminded of his failure. Nothing but discouragement can come from this procedure. Our system, therefore, seems to be unable to take care of this boy. And he is not an exception in the school room : he is ubiquitous in the city schools. An eminent authority has recently estimated that more than ten per cent. of the children in the New York public schools are mentally deficient. Dr. Groszmann claims that there are from six to seven mentally deficient children, some of whom are feeble minded, in almost every class room in the public schools of Newark. Now, it is not to be supposed that New York and New Jersey constitute a striking exception in the numbers of their dull and backward children.

A system that makes no provision for these pupils is seriously defective and needs adjustment. But the indictment against the prevalent system is more serious than this. It not only fails to provide for this large percentage of our children, but it is accused, on apparently good grounds, of being itself the cause, in large measure, of their backward condition.

Dr. Maxwell, Superintendent of public schools in New York City, has recently stated that of the 536,000 pupils in the public schools of that city no less than 200,000 were abnormally old for the class in which they were studying. But this state of affairs, he explains, is due to the fact that in these schools foreign-born children are graded according to their knowledge of the English language. In other words, the school has its mold and the child must be made to fit into it. It is the modern form of the Procrustean bed. Our system of grading is, in fact, essentially arbitrary and artificial. We proclaim loudly that education is for life and we grade the children according to age and content. It is admitted on all sides that no two children develop at the same rate, yet the

grade system leaves no room for the laggard, nor does it make adequate provision for the precocious. All the children of a class must move along together under penalty of being dropped, disgraced in their own eyes and in the eyes of their companions, and under the added penalty of being compelled to spend a whole year repeating matters that have grown distasteful; a process which usually results in permanent discouragement.

Moreover, in addition to the native tendency to vary in developmental rates, a great variety of circumstances tend to accentuate this unevenness: malnutrition, sickness, untoward family occurrences, etc. Clearly, therefore, the system should take account of these varying developmental tendencies in the children and by not doing so it is constantly producing the dull and backward pupil. Of course there are many causes contributing to dullness in children. We shall examine several of these in another connection. But if it appears on examination that our grade system, instead of alleviating this condition and reducing the number of dullards, is itself the most fertile cause of their production, it is high time that we looked into the matter with a view of either adjusting the system or replacing it by something better.

Our present system of grading children is the natural outgrowth of the simultaneous method of teaching, introduced by St. Jean Baptiste de la Salle into the schools conducted by the Christian Brothers, towards the close of the seventeenth century. "The idea primarily was to awaken interest in elementary education. He perfected the work already done by Peter Faurier, Charles Demia and others. The method of instruction, up to this time, had been largely individual. The pupils were called up to the teacher, one by one, or at most two by two, and, after the lesson had been heard, they were sent back to their seats to study. La Salle conceived the idea of grading together pupils of the same advancement, and teaching them simultaneously,—a practice now employed in primary schools everywhere."¹

¹ Seeley, *History of Education*, New York, 1904, p. 227.

All who are interested in modifying our present grade system would do well to read the essay on "The Simultaneous Method in Teaching," which will be found in *Essays Educational* by Brother Azarias. The method was framed to suit other times and to meet conditions which have long since ceased to exist. Moreover, it is the embodiment of an educational ideal that has been superseded. Brother Azarias, speaking of the origin of this method, says: "There is no uncertainty about the language of Blessed de la Salle in regard to the method he would have his disciples follow. It is no longer a single master governing a whole school; it is two, three, or more, according to the number of pupils; each taking those of the same capacity and teaching them altogether. In order to give effect to this method he regulates the duty of the masters in their respective classes: 'the Brothers shall pay particular attention to three things in the school room: 1. During the lessons, to correct every word that the scholar who is reading pronounces badly; 2. To cause all who read in the same lesson to follow therein; 3. To have silence strictly observed in the school.'

"The pupils follow in the same lesson; they observe strict silence; the master, in correcting one, is correcting all; here is the essence of the Simultaneous Method. Glancing over the pages of the admirable manual of school management which Blessed de la Salle prepared, we find scattered through them this principle inspiring all the rules of wisdom and prudence in which the book abounds. In one place we read: 'All the scholars in the same lesson shall follow together, without distinction or discernment, according as they shall be notified by the master.' On the following page it is said: 'All the scholars in each lesson shall have the same book and shall be given the same lesson.' A few pages further on we find the same thing repeated: 'All shall have but one lesson, and while one spells or reads, all the others shall follow, those who spell and read as well as those only reading.' Again he generalizes the principle for all the lessons: 'In all the lessons from alphabet-cards, syllabaries, and other books, whether French or Latin, and even during arithmetic, while one reads, all the others of the same lesson should follow; that is, they shall read to them-

selves from their books without making noise with their lips what the one reading pronounces aloud from his book.”¹

That this method was an immense advance on anything that had preceded it is conceded by all students of the history of education; nevertheless, it is not difficult to recognize the fact that the whole spirit of the method contemplates instruction or the imparting of knowledge rather than teaching as we understand it to-day. Of course there can be no return to the individual method prevailing before the days of St. Jean Baptiste de la Salle, but it is equally evident that if we are to accept as our ideal of education the promotion of mental growth and development in our pupils, some radical modifications will have to be introduced into our present grade system. If we accept the proposition that the truth presented to the growing mind has the same function to perform that food has to the growing organism, we can no longer consider it legitimate to give the self-same truth in the self-same form to every child in the class. Truth must be presented so that each child may receive according to the measure of his capacity, according to his ability to assimilate, and it must be the teacher's chief concern to secure assimilation of the truth presented and to provoke its normal functioning after it is assimilated.

Many attempts are being made at present to modify the grade system. We quote the following from an editorial in the *Atlantic Educational Journal*, December, 1907, p. 21: “The plan of group teaching or divided class, a device by which the teacher of forty or fifty pupils arranges her class into sections for more effective work, has come into general use in the larger cities of the country, and has been in vogue in Baltimore for some time. It has of course met with some opposition and misunderstanding, as all advances do, but experience has, we believe, convinced the teachers of its value. Unless one has an inveterate prejudice against new things, because they are new, the arguments for this plan seem conclusive. We subjoin an

¹ Brother Azarias, *Essays Educational*, pp. 231-232.

extract from an address by Superintendent Maxwell, of New York City, which is interesting in this connection: 'The arguments in favor of the group system (divided class) are the following: 1. It is now in general use in other cities—a strong presumption in its favor. 2. A teacher having, say, only fifteen pupils out of forty-five recite to her at one time, is better able to distinguish the individual peculiarities of each pupil. 3. The teacher being compelled to divide the recitation time for each subject into three periods, is constrained to conduct the recitation in a vigorous manner. She is constrained to avoid the two most serious errors into which teachers fall in the conduct of a recitation—requiring the children to recite verbatim, and talking too much herself. 4. Each pupil has abundant time in which to study in school. Complaints of over work and of excessive home study have practically disappeared wherever the group system is adopted. 5. The pupil learns not only to study but to inhibit his attention—an invaluable experience for practical life. 6. A pupil may be promoted just as fast or just as slowly as he ought to advance. A pupil may be advanced from one group to another group within a grade, or promoted from one grade to another at any time in the term, without skipping any part of the work.

“‘The difficulty is to find profitable employment for the section or sections not having the oral lesson. Many teachers cannot teach unless every child’s eyes are fixed upon them. They cannot see that more than a minute of this kind of so-called attention is bad for the child. Some teachers find the system hard because they give three-fourths of their attention to the groups not reciting, trying to keep them “in order,” and not realizing that more freedom should be allowed children who are working by themselves as individuals. Some teachers believe that we divide classes only because the pupils have different attainments. They do not understand that we divide classes in order that the nervous strain on the children may be lessened, that the children may feel that they are individuals, that they must not waste time waiting for fifty to get a chance to read, spell, or to compute.’”

It is not easy to see how this plan is to accomplish all that

is claimed for it by Dr. Maxwell. For instance, it is not quite clear how the group system will make it possible for a pupil to be promoted just as fast or just as slowly as he ought to advance. If this were so, we should find here an answer to the queries given above. The group system, however, does diminish the evil, since, where it is employed, it is no longer necessary to make a pupil repeat a whole year's work. Again, it is not quite easy to see how the teacher who has fifteen out of forty-five pupils recite to her at one time is better able to distinguish the individual peculiarities of each pupil, since she must have the forty-five recite to her in the same time allowed where the group system does not prevail. To hear three groups of fifteen children each in one hour is not so different, as far as opportunities for observing individual peculiarities of the children is concerned, from hearing forty-five children recite in one group in one hour. It is not evident to the casual onlooker that the nervous strain on the children will be lessened by dividing a class of forty-five into three groups and having one group recite at a time.

I do not wish it to be understood, however, that I am opposed to the divided class or group system. On the contrary, I think it an excellent thing, but this does not justify us in exaggerating its merits. It is not a panacea and it is far from being a solution of the problem before us. We do want to diminish the nervous strain on the pupils, but in how far does the group system do this? We do want a modification of the grade system which will permit each pupil to advance according to the rate of his mental development and not according to a fixed and arbitrary standard. We do want every device that will keep the pupils from contracting habits of idleness and inattention, but once more, will the group system do this? Moreover, we want the teacher to give her whole soul and all her attention to what she is doing at the moment and the group system does very emphatically divide her attention and weaken her power. Obviously there are advantages in the group system, but just as obviously there are disadvantages. Dr. Maxwell seems to have some glimmering of this fact, for he adds in the address from which I have quoted: "As the

difficulty seems to lie in the matter of program making, I invite any principal who succeeds in getting a good working program for any one grade to send it to me. The program may be for any number of groups the principal finds that the teacher can handle. It should show just what each group is supposed to be doing at each period of the school day, and it should explain the nature of any work that is not the ordinary school exercise. I also suggest that if any principal believes that he has established the system successfully in his school, he communicate that fact to me, so that I may visit the school and perhaps use it as a model for other schools."

As a matter of fact, the group plan as outlined by Dr. Maxwell ignores many of the difficulties of the problem presented by the present method of grading. Is not the whole system of large schools and close grading which obtains in our cities a mistake? The sense of individuality is not easily developed in the child when he is submerged in a large crowd. The morality of the crowd is, as a rule, much lower than that of the individual, and the larger the crowd the lower the standard. The mob will resort to acts of violence and cruelty from which each individual would, if left to himself, revolt. Moreover, habits of mental parasitism develop more readily in a large school than in a small one. But the strongest objection to our present grade system will be found in a study of the child's imitative tendencies. Perhaps in no other way does the grade system so surely develop dullards as in this, that it deprives the children of suitable models for imitation in their intellectual activities at a time when they depend almost wholly upon imitation as a means of acquiring truth.¹

Mr. Henderson makes some very happy suggestions in connection with this subject. He is not a worshipper of the big school and he is not afraid to suggest departures that seem quite radical.

"The very first requirement of the school is that it shall

¹ This aspect of the subject is developed at some length in the chapter on the Grading of School Children in *The Education of Our Girls*.

be near the home and so located that it can be reached without danger and without nervous friction. This cannot be the case where we have such large schools as we have at present, drawing their children from over a wide area. And these large schools have really no advantage. They are rather appalling to a sensitive child. He is happier and much better off as a member of a much smaller group, which appeals more directly to his love and interest. These small groups are perfectly feasible in organic education. The work itself is so largely individual that a single group may properly include children of quite unlike ages. The games and the class drills are general enough in their character to cover quite wide ranges. The habit of massing together children of the same age takes away from the pleasure and picturesqueness of life, and ends by making the children themselves quite selfish and unregardful of others. The most ideal group that we can picture is the perfect family group in three generations, the noble, white haired man and woman, and their children and their children's children.

“The little ones in a mixed school of this kind gain so much from the older children, and the older children have a tenderness and a gentle consideration brought into their hearts by the greater helplessness and greater needs of the little ones. It is a pretty sight to see a generous child caring for one a little bit younger than himself.

“The large schools with their vast numbers and exact classification, have largely been brought about by administrative rather than by human considerations. In concentrated populations they doubtless offer certain mechanical conveniences, but even from an administrative point of view they are not unqualifiedly successful. The present excuse for bringing up children in the city is the supposed educational advantage. Were this advantage much more substantial than I myself am disposed to believe it, it would be completely offset by the absence of fresh air and sunshine, freedom of motion and glad contact with Nature, to say nothing of the positive elements of disadvantage in city life. But with the organization of smaller and more diverse groups into sound schools, it becomes

possible to have the best sort of culture in even the most remote country places, anywhere, indeed, that a score or more of children may be gathered into a beautiful, large room with a teacher of organic power. It seems to me that all the advantage lies with the small, neighboring school as contrasted with the large, remote one."¹

Mr. Henderson here touches on many of the gravest defects of the grade system as it is in force in our large city schools. "The habit of massing together children of the same age takes away from the pleasure and picturesqueness of life and ends by making the children themselves quite selfish and unregardful of others." This alone should be enough to condemn the system. We are invading the child's natural rights when we deprive him of companions from whom he may learn by imitation and upon whom he may practice what he has learned. Every child grows by alternate activity at each of these poles of his existence. He imitates those older and more advanced than himself and learns the full meaning of what he imitates by practicing on others less advanced than himself. The graded school deprives him of these natural channels of acquisition and expression and substitutes in their place books and teachers and recitations. And still we wonder why dullards multiply in our schools !

A generation ago the children received the better part of their education in the home, leaving to the school merely the formal instruction. The children took part in the home industries and thus laid the foundation of a real education that gave meaning and worth to the formal education that they received in school. But to-day this is all changed. Purposeful industry is in large measure removed from the home and the child is in consequence deprived of this means of mental growth. It is for this reason that the grade system is more disastrous to-day than it was in the past. There is a very general movement in favor of industrial education as an offset to the changed home conditions of the child and this will, undoubtedly, remedy the evil in part. But something much better than the present

¹ Henderson, *Education and the Larger Life*, pp. 189-191.

system of industrial training must be presented before it will be an equivalent of the industrial home as an educational institution. Touching on this phase of the subject Mr. Henderson says: "One of the first needs in the child's day is for general bodily exercise, and this can better be given in the home than in the school; for in the home the exercise can be purposeful, some household service which will be of real use. Here, again, the service can be made a joy or a task, according to the spirit we put into it. It must be remembered that the childish will to do is rather fitful and uncertain, giving to taking up occupations with enthusiasm and then dropping them before completion. The remedy is to fill out and complete the will, and this, it seems to me, can best be done by working merrily and joyfully with the child. A small boy will help you make his bed and "tidy up" his room with the greatest pleasure if you give him your good company at the same time,—the only sort of company you ought ever to give any one,—while he would find it a very dull and distasteful task if he had to do it alone. Tell him a story, sing a duet with him, try to out-whistle him, in short, see to it that you are merry workers in this merry, charming world. But don't rob him of the service, with its measure of health and good spirit, and don't teach him to look down on women while he is still in knickerbockers by forcing him to think that these homely, necessary tasks are unsuitable for him, but none too good for his mother or sisters or the women servants. In no case, however, may this service be paid for in other coin than loving appreciation, for that is to turn the child into a miserable little trader, and quite rob the service of value. It seems to me that this home service is far wiser than that so often required of children in families of moderate means, and that is the running of errands. The children feel the friction of the market much more than grown up people do, and they are brought into touch with persons and conditions which they may not wisely meet."¹

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 188-89.

While I quite agree with Mr. Henderson that the home with its real occupations furnishes better motor training than can be supplied in the school, we must remember that the home conditions of a large portion of our school population are quite hopeless in this respect and room must be made in the schools for proper motor training. The subject is receiving wide attention at present and it would appear that this line of work will induce many profound changes in the work of our schools.

Frank Rollins, in an article entitled "Industrial Education and Culture," in the *Educational Review* for December, 1907, gives a very thoughtful presentation of the subject: "Time will not permit a detailed review of all the courses of study, but a comparative examination of the courses in fifteen of the leading manual training high schools of the United States shows that the following named subjects are mainly common to all: English, at least one foreign language; history and civics; mathematics; physics and chemistry; mechanical and free-hand drawing; joinery; wood-turning and pattern-making; forge and foundry work; and machine-shop practice. The manual training exercises for the several years have been arranged with such variety as to insure sustained interest and to prevent irksome repetition or automatic and unthinking reproduction. It has been definitely planned that any process shall be discontinued as soon as it ceases to compel the student to think, that is, as soon as it becomes merely mechanical; and this plan is justified by the consideration that a mechanical process ceases to be of educational value to a student at the very point where it begins to be of industrial value to an apprentice, since the valuable product of manual training is a disciplined mind, while the valuable product of apprentice work is some article of commerce produced with advantage only after endless repetition and acquired skill have rendered the process mechanical. Just here lies the difference between the manual training school and the trade school which are so often confused.

"In most of the schools the apportionment and distribution of manual training exercises is such that muscular exertion stops short of excessive fatigue, so that intellectual development may not suffer inhibition. Recitation and shop work alternate

so that each is a relief from the other. Many principals and teachers of manual training schools maintain that their students accomplish nearly as much in academic work as do the students of other schools, and their statements are by no means incredible.

"The city boy is confined at home, restricted on the street, and necessarily repressed in the ordinary school till he aches to do something with the motor cells of his brain and nerves acting through his rapidly growing muscles. Manual training, far from wasting his time, gives him a welcome relief from the stillness and restraint of the ordinary class room. It accustoms him to think for the sake of doing and to do because he has thought, a mode of thinking and working that is of great advantage even in the mastery of scholastic subjects. . . .

"But, it may be asked, are sawing, planing, hammering, and machine work the means of attaining culture? The answer to this question must depend upon the manner in which the work is done. Many a young man has learned to be a chronic loafer while dozing over a text-book in Greek or ethics; while many a plain carpenter or blacksmith has acquired the characteristics of real culture while shaping his material to forms of serviceableness and beauty."

And yet, after all is said that may in truth be said of the work in our manual training schools, it remains in one essential respect different from the work of the plain carpenter and the plain blacksmith and different from the work of the boy who helps his father and mother or his brothers and sisters in the performance of the homely tasks of washing dishes and making beds: it is not real; it is not helpful service, and it consequently fails to bring out the best that is in the boy or girl. Nevertheless, it is a distinct advance on the old method of formal training carried into a new economic situation in which the home no longer supplies the concrete basis for the development of the intellect and the formation of the character.

To return to the queries given at the beginning of this paper, we must strive to put an end to methods which produce the dull and backward pupil. And where he is produced by other than bad methods the remedy may usually be found in the di-

rection of suitable motor training. The grade system must be so modified that a pupil will not be violently thrust forward in advance of his development only to be rudely set back a year and compelled in humiliation and discouragement to tread the ground without interest and without hope which he has already been forced over with companions who were, at least for the time being, his superiors. The problem is of such vast importance that every teacher will strive to solve it in his own way and we shall frequently revert to phases of it in these pages.

While we are considering causes and remedies in the matter of dull and backward children, it may not be altogether out of place to suggest that the teacher make a sort of examination of conscience in this regard. There are enough obvious causes for the stupidity of children, so she need not be alarmed. She is not responsible for the grade system, and that, as we have seen, is busy all day long grinding out dullards. Heredity is responsible for the condition of some of these children, and no one should expect the teacher to supply brains where Nature has been stingy. Defective sense organs and diseases of many kinds help to supply our schools with dullards, but here we look to the medical profession for suggestion and remedy. And in many cases the home is to blame: fathers are careless and preoccupied, mothers are sometimes ignorant, slovenly, lazy. But how can the teacher remedy these things? She hasn't the choosing of the fathers and mothers of the children committed to her care, nor is it to be expected that she can exert any marked control over the homes from which the children come. I repeat, therefore, that the teacher should not be afraid to examine her own conscience to see whether in any respect she fails to improve the condition of these poor dullards or whether in anything she contributes to their making.

Let me suggest to her as a suitable table for the examination of her conscience an admirable little article in the December number (1907) of the *Educational Review*, entitled "The Withered Heart of the School," by Frederick Burk, of the San Francisco State Normal School. Not a line of this article

should be missed, but I can only reproduce here a few brief passages.

"There is a disease known as the dry rot. Out in Missouri, years ago, it used to get into the potatoes in the fall of the year and they rotted—dry rotted. In these latter days, this dry rot has gotten into the teaching profession. Young teachers start out well and healthy, but in a few years it will be found their hearts have rotted—dry rotted. The symptoms begin with a slight droop in the right shoulder, which slowly extends to the left. Then, the corners of the mouth catch the infection, and they curve downward, followed by a sympathetic droop in the corners of the eyes. Finally, the voice is affected; patients begin their sentences normally, even hopefully, but seven syllables from the end, the droop appears and the sentence is finished in a wierd wail, like unto that of the Irish Banshee who forewarns a death in the family. This is the final symptomatic stage, and if you now open the heart you will find it rotted—dry rotted. Such a teacher will chill the fire in a January stove, addle fresh laid eggs, and will furrow the brow of a happy, bare-foot boy headed for the Presidency, with the unmistakable forebrands of the penitentiary. I have seen repeatedly, with my own eyes, each of these results produced. This is the dry rot.

"The patient suffering from dry rot teaches school in the spirit of a galley slave, and with the expression of an undertaker. She rings the bell, calls the roll, and hears the spelling and arithmetic with the same spirit in which she counts the linen for the wash."

Of course Mr. Burk is here speaking of the army of unprofessional teachers who take up the work as a means of earning a livelihood while they are waiting for the "right man" to summon them to another sphere of labor. He is quite right in placing in the forefront of the accusations against the work of our public schools the unprofessional attitude of so many of their teachers. The primary and grammar grades are taught almost exclusively by women in our day and "statistics show that the average teaching life of women is something less than four years." All this is very different in our Catholic schools where every teacher who takes up the work makes it a life

work and where the motive is never bread-winning but a labor of love for Christ's little ones. Of course all public school teachers do not give up teaching at the end of four years, and by that time some of them have the dry rot. Of the dry rot teachers, Mr. Burk says, "She secures her position by influence, holds it by virtue of sickness, decrepitude, unfitness for any other occupation in life, or because she has a brother-in-law upon the Board. She hates teaching, complains of overwork, despises teachers' meetings, and cannot endure shop talk. She leads a life miserable to herself, disastrous to her pupils, and humiliating to the honor and respect due her calling."

This is rather a strong statement, but it is not the strongest in the article. Here, for instance, is a contrast between a wholesome teacher and one who has the dry rot :

"I know two teachers. One has the dry rot, the other has not.

"The one who has the dry rot reaches the schoolroom in some nervous haste and in some shortage of breath, because she always starts from home a trifle after the last moment, and she is quite unable to catch up with it. She climbs the stairs heavily and now the droop becomes quite evident, for while her body is being forced ahead her Soul is hanging back and thus her shoulders are tugged out of shape. A Soul which has to be carried upstairs grows very heavy, especially at the last landing. At the door of the class room, the Soul balks completely, and finally wrests itself loose from the body and flees downstairs and out into the open air of the meadow, where it plays all day long with the butterflies.

"The body enters the school room. An awful thing is a body without a Soul. It stalks into the room and turns its glassy eyes upon the children and chills them. Their little souls are frozen into milk-white globules, and slip into holes in the back part of the skull kindly provided by indulgent nature. There they stay all day in a state of stupefaction. As soon as the souls are frozen, then out troop the forty little devils who live in every child born of Adam and Eve. They come out to practice playing the devil. The day is an awful one for the soulless body, stalking about the class room, or sitting haunched up at the desk while it runs its skinny fingers down the spelling column; awful for the shriveled little souls

as they listen horrified to the deviltry of the forty little devils tormenting the soulless body, as only the combined deviltry of 1600 (40 x 40) little devils playing havoc in the forty soul-deserted skulls can invent. They keep the soulless body in a state of frenzied madness for six hours, and it is especially agonized as it catches a glimpse of its Soul outside making merry with the butterflies in imagination's meadow.

"The clock hands drag wearily towards three. Throughout the endless day the eyes of the soulless body watch them narrowly, for when those three chimes sound, then will the night be over, then will she join her Soul upon woman's ancient greensward, then will she buy the sweetmeats of woman's life by the ill-gotten gains of the horrid labor. Then will the body's service be at an end.

"The clock strikes three. Forty little frozen souls deliquesce with a pop. Sixteen hundred little devils, grumbling, shrink into captivity. Forty little children pour out of that schoolroom as from the Black Hole of Calcutta.

"A moment later, an outworn, bedraggled, nerve-racked body shambles wearily out the school gate and down the street. Her hour has come—but too late. She is now too tired to frolic upon the meadow. Rest! she must have rest. Imagination's meadows dissolve from view and naught there is to life but a broken and stony ground over which she must pick her way morn and night—with hell between.

"The teacher who has not the dry rot gets to school early. She has to race with her Soul, but the Soul always gets there first anyhow. Women's souls, when rotless, have a natural affinity for children, and this woman's Soul inflates the moment it enters the schoolroom. The children's little souls, by responsive sympathy, likewise inflate. This mutual inflation wrinkles their skins with smiles. Soon the little souls are romping about the schoolroom with the woman's soul in most cheery fashion, even if their little bodies are sitting bolt upright in their seats as all proper school children should. . . . This schoolroom is, in fact, a feast of souls, little and big, and sometimes the teacher catches a glimpse of the All-Soul smiling down upon them approvingly, and then it is there comes to her that soul-lift which, once experienced, makes

all other life joys pale into insignificance. On the other hand, the expansion of the little children's souls in some mysterious way loosens up all the clods of the intellect so that they become porous and absorb knowledge as a dry sponge absorbs water. There are never any stupid children in this teacher's room. I have heard her indignantly deny the allegation time and time again. I do not know how to explain or make clear the whole-souled fascination which the soul-expansion and intellect-absorption of her pupils exercise over this teacher. Somehow she feels this pupil growth as a personal matter, and is seemingly unable to distinguish between them and herself; their growth, their joys, and their disappointments are her own; and as I have watched her these years, her personality has grown to include so many varying phases of human nature in its innocent, childlike forms, that there glows from her soft grey eyes a breadth of human sympathy and intelligence that few win. . . .

"The clock strikes three, and she trips downstairs and out into the open air of life, not as her nerve-racked sister, but as an artist who leaves her studio at nightfall eager for the morrow's light. The difference between an artist and an artisan lies in the fact that the artist finds happiness, inspiration, and highest joys in his bread-winning labor, while the artisan finds no pleasure in his work and labors merely to earn money to buy joys outside his work. The teacher without the dry rot belongs to the artist class. Happy are they, those artist workers, whose bread-winning occupation is so agreeable that they brew the honeys of life both from the making and the dispensing, for they draw double pay and never labor."

There will scarcely be a disagreement among educators as to the truthfulness of this picture. The work of a teacher is vital and it never can be done efficiently by one whose heart is not in it. It is only the children of the Kingdom who labor for love that are the true artists. When teaching is undertaken merely for the bribe that is offered in the form of wages, it will be the work of a hireling, the work of an artisan, and this is fatal. We may suffer the artisan where it is a question of smelting, or mining, or laying bricks, but when the souls of children are being dealt with, when the intelligence and the

morality and the character of the future citizens are at stake, none but true artists should be allowed to touch the work.

But where do the artisan teachers come from? Mr. Burk's statement is true for the majority of young teachers, they "start out well and healthy, but in a few years it will be found their hearts have rotted—dry rotted." This only adds one more problem to the list of those that are awaiting solution. It seems to offer one more accusation against the prevailing system in our schools. What if it should be found, on investigation, that the school system not only manufactures dullards, but renders soulless the great majority of its teachers?

Is the work of teaching, the most glorious vocation ever given to man or to woman, so lacking in attractiveness, so devoid of charm that the young men and the young women who come to it heart-whole and full of enthusiasm for the work are in a few years reduced to the pitiable condition of the soulless teacher that is here portrayed? It surely is not the vocation of teaching itself that is responsible for this deterioration, nor can I agree, entirely, with Mr. Burk in assigning the cause to an inherited feminine attitude of mind. "They like the idea of independence and all that, but the work—that is the galling part. Besides, it is not altogether proper, many say and most think. So, as teachers, they stand with one foot in the old life and one foot in the new, and as in the case of the late Mrs. Lot, they can't help looking back to the old, into its toothsome flesh pots, its artless joys, and its happy sorrows. They are continually obliged to look where they are stepping, and this continual twisting of the neck, front and back, makes them dizzy, and this is the cause of the dry rot. They love their old life, and, woman like, they can't help shedding a few tears *in memoriam*, and sobbing a few sobs of protest. Therefore they enter the new life with their hearts more or less harking backward. Of course the disease is not limited to teaching, but is a general condition in all fields where woman works for a living—among women doctors, women lawyers, sales ladies, cook ladies. . . .

"What seems the chief argument against the theory in the teaching field is that men also become victims of the disease. Our woman philosopher doubtless would explain that the men

catch it from the women: Adam, it will be remembered, fell from grace in this way and thereby sin became epidemic."

It is a pity to spoil so clever an arraignment, but, really, one must not allow our women teachers to be blamed unjustly for their soulless condition. An artist must have freedom; he must be given a part in shaping the work of his hands; while his soul lives in him, he must give expression to the visions of beauty that haunt his imagination. Deprive the artist of this, and, whether he be teacher or painter or poet, his soul will flee from him, and the soulless body will be converted into an artisan.

What if it should be the school system that has legislated against the entrance into the school of any teacher's soul? What if the real murderer be found in the Superintendent's office? When the system undertakes to dictate the manner and the method of every item in the teacher's day's work, when it refuses to the teacher any voice in the organization of the school, in the selection of text-books, in the shaping of methods, in the succession of lessons; when, in a word, the system reduces the teachers to the condition of factory hands, when it aims at making them cogs in an industrial machine, how can the defenceless teachers, whether they be men or women, escape the dry rot? Just so long as our public schools are dominated by the one-man power, just so long as the teachers are given no opportunity for self-expression in their work, just so long will the rank and file of the teachers be soulless, and just so long will our children fly from the school in disgust at the first possible moment, preferring to labor in the streets or in the factories rather than have the souls ground out of them by the monotonous routine of the school and by the lifeless manikins that are made to do service as teachers.

The teacher's salary may, and we think should, be increased, but no salary can ever compensate her for the life which the system crushes out of her. School boards may secure fine buildings and elaborate equipment, but the school atmosphere will continue to be poisonous and soul-killing for the children until such time as the system makes room for the souls of the teachers.

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary. A History of Religious Toleration in Maryland from the First Settlement until the American Revolution. By William T. Russell, S. T. L. J. H. Furst Co., Baltimore, 1907. 8vo. Pp. xxxviii and 621. \$1.50.

It is significant that Maryland has not yet erected a fitting memorial to Cecilius Calvert to whom she owes not only her foundation as a colony, but the still greater glory of being the first land of religious toleration among the peoples of the earth. As a class it is true the people of the Southern States have never been over boastful; on the contrary they have been too modest or indifferent about their great deeds. But in the case of Cecilius Calvert one is forced to conclude that much of the neglect has been due precisely to religious intolerance. From the time when Maryland historians began to tell the story of the State there have existed two parallel versions of its growth. One has borne fair testimony to the debt of gratitude that Maryland owes to the Catholics who founded the colony. Writers like William Hand Browne and Clayton C. Hall are its latest and best representatives. Another school has persistently tried to minimize this debt by distorting the plain facts. Every possible fact of a controversial nature has been carefully unearthed by them for the purpose of taking away from Cecilius Calvert and his fellow Catholics the glory of inaugurating in the New World religious toleration. One such writer attempts to trace Maryland's foundation not to Calvert but to his arch-enemy Claiborne and to the trading post at Kent Island. The motives of Calvert in proclaiming toleration have been called into question, being variously put down as pecuniary or political or the result of fear; he acted it is said, from anything but a sincere love of religious freedom and the desire to extend its benefits to others. The religious sincerity of his convert father, George Calvert, has been doubted in spite of the great sacrifices he made for his new faith and the fact that he could have gained much by professing Protestantism, the only argument to the contrary being some difference of opinion he had with the Jesuit missionaries on matters that in no way

affected his faith. An attempt has been made to prove that after all the majority of the settlers were Protestants; even if this were true, it would not do away with the fact that the colony was conceived by a Catholic, organized and financed by Catholics who (even if a numerical minority) constituted its brains and culture and driving force. The Act of 1649 that made Religious Toleration a written law of the land has been impugned. An attempt has been made to prove that it was passed by a majority of Protestants, an error long ago refuted (1855) by Davis' "Day-Star of American Freedom." The Act has been criticized as not granting formally full religious freedom, regardless of the fact that its apparent limitations were necessitated by English Protestant suspicion of Calvert, and of another important fact, viz., that the Act intended to and did put into written law the religious liberty which from the foundation of the colony had been the customary law of the land. Finally, all else failing, such historians have been willing to sacrifice their local patriotism for the sake of religious animosity, by holding that the glory of being the pioneers of Religious Toleration belongs, in point of time, not to the Calverts but to Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island. Plain evidence to the contrary is furnished by the unvarying custom of religious freedom in Maryland under the Calverts prior to any similar provision by Roger Williams. This anti-Catholic temper, we regret to say, is largely responsible for the absence from the Monumental City of any fitting memorial to George and Cecilius Calvert, the great and good founders of Maryland. It is now proposed to erect a statue of Cecilius Calvert in front of the Court House, though some undefinable opposition seems constantly to delay the execution of the project, the last excuse being that such a statue would mar the artistic beauty of said building. It seems to be a question of ordinary gratitude and mental breadth, not of artistic whim or fancy.

In the volume before us, Father Russell has dissipated forever the cloud of doubt thrown around the name of the early Calverts. Maryland's history, chiefly from the viewpoint of her claim to be the cradle of American religious freedom, is critically examined from its earliest conception in the brain of George Calvert down to the entrance into the confederation of States. He proves beyond all cavil that under the Catholic régime, from 1634 to 1652, religious toleration was the constant, though perhaps unwritten, law of the colony; that the Calverts were genuine Catholics; that

the Act of Toleration was the work of Catholics. In 1652 a Puritan spirit of revolt resulted in the Calverts being robbed of their Proprietary rights and in the passage of an "Act Concerning Religion" by which both Catholics and Episcopalians were disfranchised. In 1658 the Calverts were restored and religious freedom again became the law of the land. But again in 1689 after the fall of the English Stuarts the Calverts were stripped of their rights, a royal governor was appointed by King William, and the Episcopal Church was established in Maryland. Under the new régime Catholics fared no better than under the Puritans. Until about 1763 the Catholic colonists were the victims of many obnoxious laws, some merely irritating, others degrading, but all aimed at the restriction if not the extinction of their faith. For them there was no longer freedom of worship; they were hampered in the education of their children, disfranchised, over-taxed, etc. As the American Revolution drew near, there came a relaxation of these odious laws. The good will of the Catholics of Canada and France was henceforth desirable, and so religious fanaticism gave way before the growing passion of a common patriotism. With a generosity worthy of their faith, the persecuted Catholics threw in their lot with their oppressors and contributed their efforts to the formation of the United States; thereafter, by common agreement written into the Constitution of the United States, religious intolerance was forever proscribed.

Fullness of material and equity of judgment are evident even from a cursory reading of this work. It is equally safe to say that this glorious chapter of Maryland history, as told by Father Russell, will not be seriously modified by subsequent writers. Doubtless there is yet valuable manuscript evidence hidden away in unexplored domestic libraries, in collections of private letters held by old Maryland families, (when not used for kindling wood, as we know to have happened in a certain instance) in hitherto unexplored records of the Assembly and law courts, perhaps even in manuscripts of various kinds still kept in European archives. However, this evidence will not materially alter the conclusions now generally reached by standard historians. The evidence is practically all in; indeed, it has been long before the public. The special merit of this work lies in its quality of completeness and good order, and in the succinctness and point that characterize the entire narrative. The author has gone over the whole story with truly Teutonic industry. No important point, apparently,

has been overlooked. He has used well the opportunities afforded him by more than a dozen years of close contact with the best sources of information, both civil and ecclesiastical, accessible in Baltimore.

The form of the book is equally praiseworthy. A judicious arrangement of chapters renders the reader's task a pleasant one. The bibliography is exhaustive and the index is quite complete. A well-selected series of appendixes supplies first-hand evidence to those readers who may choose to give the subject a more critical attention.

The narrative is generally free from all bitterness. This is apparent not only in dealing with Protestant antagonists but also in the author's treatment of the unfortunate controversy which in the early days of the colony broke out between Lord Baltimore and the Jesuit missionaries. On this latter question the author is so dispassionate that some of his readers will be tempted to put down to ecclesiastical courtesy his statement that this controversy "is still wrapped in considerable mystery." If, on the other hand, the general temper of the book be undeniably controversial, the blame (if blame there be) belongs to the above-mentioned narrow school of historians who have given ample cause for irritation. Speaking more generally, Catholic historians are often handicapped, especially since the Protestant Reformation, by the hard needs of controversy. Incessant attacks upon every historical question affecting their religion have put them too habitually in the unenviable position of "apologists" rather than of "historians" properly speaking. Hence a distinct loss in effectiveness, if not in fullness of scholarship (not always the hand-maid of controversy). This defensive attitude when too constantly evident, is one reason why scholarly Catholic works are often refused by Protestant readers the serious attention easily accorded to writers of inferior ability, but who offer at least an appearance of unbiassed judgment, and are not suspected of writing in defence of a cause. In proof of this, we need only recall the lasting admiration accorded to Lingard by Protestant readers of a more bigoted age, a tribute well deserved by not only his vast learning but also by his elegant scholarly superiority to party-bias.

In the work of Father Russell we note occasionally this apologetic attitude, and it is the only serious criticism we feel called on to offer. A more unimpassioned tone from beginning to end is desirable and may easily be attained in future editions. Other-

wise Protestant readers may not accord this unique work its proper place among the standard histories of Maryland, but relegate it (too hastily) to that limbo of oblivion where lie so many narratives rightly or wrongly termed "sectarian." The story of early Catholic Maryland can henceforth rest upon its own merits. The author's preparatory statement that the treatment of his subject by a Catholic is beset by difficulties "which the non-Catholic historian can afford to ignore" does not therefore appeal to us. A fact is a fact, whoever tells it; in the end real facts must prevail over all prejudices. Still less does it seem necessary to array "bare facts in the form and color furnished by the comments of non-Catholic historians." The mere statement of such a method is calculated to arouse the very suspicions which it is intended to allay. But these are blemishes only, and can be removed.

The merit of this composition is enhanced by the circumstances in which it was written. During its preparation the author was constantly occupied with parochial and administrative duties. Nevertheless he found time to execute the thorough and painstaking researches which, as said above, lend to his work a permanent value and give it a rightful place among all future works of reference on the matters of which it treats. We commend his example to all our young clergy, being convinced that where there is a will there is a way, and that in spite of their numerous cares not a few of them are both able and called to accomplish intellectual work at once high in character, scientific in form, and very serviceable to the Catholic Church in our beloved country.

We earnestly recommend the book—chiefly to American Catholics who will find it a full defence of their claims to be the pioneers and at all stages of our country's history the most consistent advocates of religious toleration. We have too long allowed this crown to be worn by others. It is to be hoped that our indifference shall one day yield to such convincing work as Father Russell sets before us, and that we shall eventually repair our neglect of the past and correct the unappreciative temper from which unselfish Catholic historians like John Gilmary Shea so notably suffered.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

English Monastic Life. By Abbot Gasquet, with numerous illustrations, maps and plans. 3d edition (New York, Benziger, 1905). 8vo. Pp. 326.

Parish Life in Medieval England. By Abbot Gasquet, with numerous illustrations (New York, Benziger, 1906). 8vo. Pp. xix, 279.

In these volumes, valuable if only for their well-chosen bibliographies and many, often rare and unique, illustrations, Abbot Gasquet has placed before us a fair and reliable account of certain sides of the public religious life of medieval England. The volume that deals with the monastic life describes in as many chapters, the material parts of the monastery, its rulers, its officers (obedientiaries), its daily life, and external relations. A chapter devoted to "The Nuns of Medieval England" (pp. 154-180) is of surpassing interest, and should be read in connection with Montalembert's classic account of the Anglo-Saxon nuns. The good nuns of the thirteenth century little suspected that their account books would once be investigated, not for proof of honest and intelligent administration, but for the revelations they offer concerning the social and religious life of the nunneries. A number of maps exhibit the distribution of monasteries throughout England according to the different branches of the great Benedictine brotherhood (Black Monks, Cistercians, Carthusians, also the Regular Canons, and the Premonstratensians); there is, moreover, a map of the distribution of the nunneries. A glance at the index exhibits the many uses of this little manual of the monastic life in Catholic England. Not less useful or interesting is the volume on the parochial life of medieval England. It treats successively of the nature of the parish, the parish church, the parish clergy, parish officials, parochial finances, church services, festivals, the administration of the sacraments, the pulpit, parish amusements, guilds and fraternities. To relate in detail the contents of such a work would carry us too far. Suffice it to say that in these two volumes Abbot Gasquet has produced a little encyclopedia of the ecclesiastical and religious life of the English people while yet they were united in the Catholic faith.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Psallite Sapienter (Psallieret Weise). By Dom Maurus Wolter, O. S. B. Third edition, Vol. V. (Psalms 121-150). B. Herder, Freiburg, 1907. Pp. 565. \$2.45.

The fifth and final volume of the third edition of the classic commentary on the psalms by Dom Maurus Wolter lies before us. It is unnecessary to repeat what has been already said in the *Bulletin* (XIII, 284) concerning this admirable work. Besides the "Liturgical Register" or index of feasts, masses, and ceremonial occasions, with reference to appropriate psalms and commentary, there is a General Index that enables the reader to profit easily by the great wealth of psalm-exegesis which is stored up in these five volumes.

The Christian view of human life, and the religious philosophy peculiar to a genuinely Christian society, have been drawn "*plenis haustibus*" from the Psalms. In the measure that they are familiar to us we put on Jesus Christ whom they so constantly announce and describe, and in the measure that we are ignorant of them we fall away from the Christian ideal and become of the world worldly. Dom Wolter's book is a delightful encyclopedia of the Psalms, at once pious and learned, mystical and practical, ascetic and historical in content. It ought to be in the library of every priest who knows the glorious tongue of Goethe and Schiller, and even in the family library of all who speak or read the same.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

A Day in the Cloister. Adapted from the German of Dom Sebastian von Oer, St. Martin's Abbey, Beuron, by Dom Bede Camm, St. Thomas' Abbey, Erdington. Second edition (Benziger, New York, 1906). 8o. Pp. 291.

"This simple and unvarnished description of life in a monastery," says the translator, "may not be without interest, especially as so much curiosity is often evinced as to the details of monastic life. . . . the author has simply recounted what he has seen, and known, and lived." The seventeen chapters are, therefore, a delightful and an accurate account of the ordinary routine of existence in a house of Benedictines. To mention the titles is to exhibit the substance of the book: The Monastery Door, The Cloister, Before the Statue of the Founder, Night, The Divine

Office, Morning Labour, The High Mass and the Monastery Church, The Abbot, The Frater or Refectory, Recreation, The Lay-Brothers, The Library, The Sacristy, The School of Art, The Novitiate, Departure. It is like a brief "précis" of the religious life of Europe during a thousand years, a summary of medieval civilization and spiritual refinement, even though, as the German author puts it, one day in the cloister is as much like another as the waves of the sea are to some lonely light-keeper. The translation is spirited and idiomatic, and the work deserves a place in convent and parochial school libraries as at once a little history of the Benedictine temper and works, and an impulse to the higher and purer and more godlike life of the spirit.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

A Synthetical Manual of Liturgy. By the Rev. Adrian Vigourel, S. S., professor of Liturgy in the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris. Translated from the French with the author's approbation by Rev. John A. Nainfa, S.S., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md. (Baltimore, John Murphy Co., 1907). 8o. Pp. 251.

Fr. Nainfa deserves much credit for presenting in an English dress this excellent little "précis," or summary of the science of Liturgy; with its help the student may easily follow, still better, may deeply interest himself in the fuller oral teaching of the professor, while it also enables him to correct and round out his class notes, not the least benefit of a good text-book. A good bibliography accompanies the little work and a very full index in bold type adds to its serviceableness. As to the content, it is scarcely necessary to add that the youthful student will find here all the essentials of the venerable liturgical lore, while the busy priest may easily replenish from these pages his somewhat forgotten or uncertain ceremonial wisdom. The book is well-printed, portable and neat in size, and in every way worthy of a place among the "necessary books of the average ecclesiastical library."

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Story of Ancient Irish Civilization. By P. W. Joyce (Longmans, London, 1907). Pp. viii, 175.

Boulogne-Sur-Mer, St. Patrick's Native Town. By Rev. William Canon Fleming (London, R. and T. Washbourne, 1907). Pp. vi, 92.

St. Brigid, Patroness of Ireland. By Rev. J. A. Knowles, O.S.A. (New York, Benziger, 1907). Pp. 277.

Rambles in Eirinn. By William Bulfin (New York, Benziger, 1907). Pp. 456.

The Rhymed Life of St. Patrick. By Katharine Tynan (New York, Benziger, 1907). 4o. Pp. 31.

1. The distinguished author says of this little book that "it has been written and published with the main object of spreading as widely as possible among our people, young and old, a knowledge of the civilization and general social conditions of Ireland from the fifth or sixth to the twelfth century when it was wholly governed by native rulers." It is also written to teach many English and Anglo-Irish persons that "the old Irish, far from being barbarians, were bright, intellectual and cultured people; that they had professions, trades, and industries, pervading the whole population, with clearly defined ranks and grades of society, all working under an elaborate system of native laws; and that in the steadying and civilising arts and pursuits of every day they were as well advanced, as orderly, and as regular as any other European people of the same period." In reality it is a kind of catechism of medieval Irish civilization based on the author's admirable "Social History of Ireland" in two volumes described at length in the *Bulletin* (1904, X, 69-80), and previously reduced to a single volume of 598 pages. Dr. Joyce rightly says: "The ordinary history of our country has been written by many and the reader has a wide choice. But in the matter of our Social History he has no choice at all. For these three books of mine have, for the first and only time, brought within the reach of the general public a knowledge of the whole social life of Ancient Ireland." An exhaustive index adds greatly to the value of this book that is small in size but not in importance, reliability, or general interest.

2. In this little work Canon Fleming of London makes a learned and ingenious plea for Boulogne-sur-mer in Gaul as the true birth-

place of St. Patrick. It is, he maintains, the "Bonavem (Bonau-em) Taberniae" of St. Patrick's "Confession" and the "Nemthor" at which St. Fiacc, his earliest (sixth century, metrical) biographer places his birth:

Natus est Patritius Nempturri
Ut refertur in narrationibus

Canon Fleming differs from Colgan, Ware, Ussher, and Cardinal Moran, who agree that St. Patrick was born in Scotland (North Britain) though they disagree as to the exact place. Keating and Lanigan, he maintains, are the true guides, and they agree on Armoric Britain (Gaul), and especially on Boulogne as the birth-place of our saint. There can be no question, he says, of Ireland or of Wales, much less of Great Britain itself (region of the lower Severn) as Professor Bury suggests. The "opusculum" of Canon Fleming is erudite and he makes more than one good point. The question, however, is likely to remain open, for the texts alleged on both sides are obscure in sense and corrupt, or at least uncertain, in language. They are also more or less remote from the saint's own time (if we except his "Confession" and that throws little clear light on "Bonavem Taberniae;" their almost studied reserve or reticence suggests that the writers had few or no positive records before them. Moreover, such texts, however ancient, have likely enough suffered interpolation. This work is disfigured by many misprints, especially of Latin words; it would gain much if there had been at the beginning a brief critical description of all the documents referred to—their character, approximate age, best edition, condition of text, etc. The question is so intricate, at the present day, that a good-sized book is needed to fairly discuss it, in a fully informational way, with sufficient treatment of each point raised, and the necessary archaeological illustrations, without which the argument is often lost or but dimly apprehended by the average reader.

3. Fr. Knowles has produced for the centenary of the foundation of the Brigidine Nuns (1807-1907) a popular life of St. Bridget, fitted for pious reading and edification. The few certain or quasi-certain facts of her life are set in a framework of eloquent language, so that the little book has rather the air of a panegyric than a learned discussion of the authorities and a critical study of the events of her life, above all of the nature and

origin of the marvels that in the various ancient lives have crowded out the facts that we should now be pleased to know and which would certainly shed no little light on the history of Ireland's conversion, as well as on the social and political order of Scotie life in the fifth century.

4. This is a delightful guide-book through parts of Irish Ireland. Mr. Bulfin is a poet of no mean flight, an erudite narrator, an ardent patriot and a pressman of broad experience. No wonder that he writes with fervor and sympathy about the beloved island that fascinates forever her children's children from pole to pole. No child of Irish parents could read this story of a few months' bicycling through Ireland without a strong desire to visit the romantic land of his ancestors, on which occasion he could have no better guide than our author.

5. This prettily illustrated brief metrical life of St. Patrick may be read with profit by all, but particularly by young people, to whom the prose story of the great Saint often appears very remote and hazy. This tasty quarto-brochure finds its place naturally in the living room of the family or in the nursery where both little and big children will learn from it the main outlines of the life and duty of one of the great national apostles of Christianity.

The Fathers of the Desert. Translated from the German of the Countess Hahn-Hahn, by Emily F. Bowden, with a chapter on the Spiritual Life of the first Six Centuries by John Bernard Dalgairns, Priest of the Oratory. In two volumes, 2d. ed. London, Burns and Oates, 1907. \$2.50.

Few books have so affected the spiritual history of mankind as the ancient "*Vitae Patrum*," or lives of the Christian men and women who about the fourth and fifth centuries of our era abandoned the over-refinement and super-culture of Roman society. Dom Cuthbert Butler has lately put in his debt the world of scholars by his admirable edition of the oldest texts of these wonderfully influential biographies, whose first author we shall probably never know. And now we welcome this reprint of an earlier English translation (London, 1867), done in idiomatic English and with a certain pious fervor of diction that makes it excellent spiritual reading, especially for those whom physical weakness, or mental

fatigue, or lack of training and practice, prevent from enjoying purely ascetic considerations. Here history (marvelous, but substantially true in all its chief outlines and traits), oriental manners and social features, and "curiosa" of all kinds combine to make an ideal book of pious reading. These stories were read and enjoyed by St. Augustine; they drew a John Cassian from Gaul to Egypt, and they fashioned the spiritual temper of a Columbanus. Our spiritually emasculated time is not so far away from the age in which they first originated, in which some mind-weary civil servant of Rome went through the "loca deserta" of the East and while yet under the spell of the supernatural life he there saw, gave to the world his impressions in all their freshness and directness. The introductory essay of the late Fr. Dalgairns is in its place, and furnishes a desirable orientation, vivid, picturesque, and circumstantial, of the nature of primitive Christianity, its worship, feasts and fasts, the so-called "Deserts" of Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, the anchorites, and the life of evangelical counsels; finally the antique glory of Constantinople and Alexandria, whose enjoyment was the first and not the least sacrifice of a Paul, an Antony, and a Pachomius.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Juris Antiquissima. Canonum et conciliorum Graecorum interpretationes latinae, edidit Cuthbertus Hamilton Turner, A. M. Vol. I, Part I, Canones Apostolorum, Nicaenorum Patrum subscriptiones; Part II, Nicaeni Concilii praefationes capitula Symbolum Canones. Vol. II, Part I, Concilia Ancyritanum et Neocaesariense. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 40, 1899-1907. \$12.50.

Following in the footsteps of the great historical canonists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Justel, Quesnel, the Ballerini, Mansi, Gonzalez) Dr. Cuthbert Turner has undertaken to publish a critical edition of all the oldest documents of Western ecclesiastical legislation, *i. e.*, the Latin translations of the Apostolic Canons (Dionysius Exiguus) the "Nomina Episcoporum" of the Council of Nicaea, the Creed and the canons of that council (also the brief "Praefationes" in the various translations of both), the canons of other fourth century councils (Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, Constantinople), together

with those of Ephesus and Chalcedon. To these he hopes to add at some future day the Latin text of the fourth and fifth century councils of Africa, Gaul and Spain. In other words when this work is completed we shall have a critical text of the "Corpus Juris Canonici" as it existed in the Latin West when in the first half of the sixth century Dionysius Exiguus began at Rome his codification of ecclesiastical law that soon was adopted by the Roman Church. Or rather we shall have a critical text of one-half of that law (the canons of the Councils), since there remain yet the papal decretals, only fragments of which, however, antedate the end of the fourth century. The oldest and best manuscripts have been consulted by Dr. Turner in many libraries of Europe, especially the Vatican, and he has profited by the learned labors of old and new savants in this difficult province of ecclesiastical learning, notably by the epoch-making work of Friedrich Maassen (*Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande*, Gratz, 1871). A critical apparatus of variants and "adnotatiunculae" for the better comprehension of the text itself or its literary history represents the long toil and acumen of the patient and persevering scholar, to whom no "minutiae" are useless that help in the restoration of original documents to the exact state in which they left the hands of the authors, *i. e.*, in which they originally influenced the circles for which they were destined.

Dr. Turner is to be congratulated on the calm objectivity of his work. He has not turned aside, for polemical purposes, from his scholarly task, but has aimed solely at replacing before the eyes of the theologian and the historian the Latin ecclesiastico-juridical texts most regularly used in the tribunals of the Western Church from the accession of Constantine to that of Justinian, *i. e.*, precisely when the authority of the Roman Church was most rapidly developing and her beneficent influence was ever more widely radiating over the great provinces of Africa, Gaul and Spain. Every student of early ecclesiastical history, especially in the West, will often need to consult this work, one of the most serviceable that have issued from the Clarendon Press.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Races and Immigrants in America. By John R. Commons
(New York, The Macmillan Company, 1907). Pp. xiii, 242.

This new work by Professor Commons is a popular presentation of what is known generally as the "immigration problem." It does not embody the results of a careful first-hand study of the various immigrant races in America or in the countries from which they come, nor is the treatment of any of the large aspects of the subject exhaustive. The merit of the work is that in it most pertinent, and hitherto widely scattered and uncorrelated facts bearing upon the economic, political, and social effects of recent immigration are interestingly and clearly set forth in skillful combination by a recognized authority on American labor conditions.

In his first chapter Professor Commons states the problem of the relation of immigration to successful democracy, as he sees it. In its lowest terms this is the extent to which all races and classes in America and now coming to America are, or can be made, equally capable of using those "equal opportunities before the law" which are the legal bases of American democracy. This question the reader must answer for himself as each race element is passed in review. The negro race obviously fails by much to come up to the standard, and its failure is so marked that the problem of dealing with this race has come to be called "*the race problem.*" No one would admit more quickly than the author that his chapter on the negro does no more than skim the surface of the subject; like his chapter on "Colonial Race Elements" it is evidently inserted for the sake of symmetry. The treatment of the negro question is, however, interesting and suggestive, and clearly indicative of the present tendencies of the freedmen as a race.

The discussion of the position and capacities of recent immigrant races is very properly prefaced by a survey of the condition of the immigrant classes in the countries from which they come. The real crux of the question is then reached in the chapters on the effects of these large and heterogeneous additions to our population upon conditions of American life, industrial, political, and social, and the nature of the reaction of American environment upon the newcomers. Politically the problem is one of how far the immigrants are fitted individually for intelligent and honest use of the franchise, and of the degree to which repre-

sentative government is made increasingly difficult by the division of voters for or against issues or candidates on strictly racial lines. For the reader who prefers an exposition of fact unvarnished with opinion or recommendation, however authoritative, this political chapter is marred by endorsement of the referendum and of a specific suffrage qualification. The evil social effects of immigration, evidenced by statistics and confirmed by observation, are increasing poverty and crime traceable to greater congestion of population in cities, under conditions making for a lowering of physical and moral powers of resistance. The brief discussion of religious influences brought to bear on the immigrant and his response to them, though possibly not purely objective, is suggestive.

The chapters on "Industry" and "Labor" are the strongest in the book. Industrially immigration is viewed from two standpoints, that of the production of wealth and that of its distribution. Admitting the obvious fact that immigration has permitted a greater production of wealth than would have been possible without it, Professor Commons distinguishes between the motives of increasing profits and of increasing production, and suggests that it is the former and not the latter which has led employers to make use of cheap immigrant labor and assert its necessity for the development of our resources. The application of machinery and science would in many industries, he holds, be more truly productive, but their introduction is retarded by the greater facility and smaller initial outlay with which quantitative increases in the labor supply can be, and are obtained. Thus over-production in times of feverish expansion of industry is furthered by the hasty injection of low-paid foreigners into the laboring population, with a resultant lowering of purchasing power—a policy which increases the disparity between output and demand and intensifies the "extreme vacillations of prosperity and depression which characterize American industry." On the side of distribution the effect of the influx of immigrant labor is to keep down wages. Hence we have "low wages, the sweat shop, the slums, all on account of the excessive competition of wage-earner against wage-earner." The falling off of the birth rate in families of native-born skilled mechanics is accounted for in part by a reluctance to rear children who would be compelled to compete against immigrants in the labor market. Altogether the work, though not exhaustive and not without its leanings, is a timely

and stimulating summary of current information on a subject of great public importance.

D. McCABE.

Éléments de philosophie scientifique et de philosophie morale.

Ch. Lahr, S. J. Paris: Beauchesne, 1908. Pp. vi, 486.
Fr. 6.00.

This manual of philosophy is composed in accordance with the official program for the examinations of the students in the classes of mathematics. As this program includes only the elements of scientific and of moral philosophy, the text-book deals chiefly with questions of logic, methodology, ethics and sociology. But in special chapters and appendices, the author has aptly introduced other important problems so as to form a complete and harmonious whole, point out the connections of the different questions and indicate the foundations on which the solutions ultimately depend. The explanations and discussions are everywhere methodical, clear and concise, and the work seems adapted perfectly to the needs of the students for whom it is intended.

Summula Philosophiae Scholasticae. Vol. III (Pars altera)

Ethica, J. S. Hickey, O. Cist. Dublin, Browne and Nolan; New York, Benziger, 1907. Pp. v, 265.

This volume has the same merits as its predecessors: simplicity, clearness, accuracy, precision of thought and expression. While using the traditional framework, the author, by the judicious selection and adaptation of old and new materials, has given us a solid and well-proportioned edifice. As in the other volumes, the addition of appropriate quotations in English is an agreeable feature. In a Latin text-book, however, one might prefer to see St. Thomas and the Popes' Encyclicals quoted in Latin rather than in English.

The King Over the Water. By A. Shield and Andrew Lang.
Longmans, New York, 1907. Pp. 499.

It is not without a feeling of surprise that one familiar with the history of England as it has been served up by partisans finds authors so bold as not only to refrain from strewing upon the

grave of James II the customary floral tributes labeled by historical botanists as "weakling," tyrant," "bigot," etc., but actually courageous enough to set tradition at defiance and adduce proofs of his undoubted courage, a courage that had been tried on land and sea; contending moreover that James had been a skillful and victorious naval commander and an industrious and capable Admiralty chief. This volume, however, is neither a defence of James II nor a panegyric on his virtues. Despite historical proofs it will be no easy task to place James before the world in any light other than that in which Macaulay imagined him at the Boyne.

It is no part of the purpose of these authors to retouch the familiar picture of James II but merely, as the title of their book suggests, to sketch the career of his patient and courageous though unfortunate son, James III and VIII, better known perhaps as the "obstinate old Pretender." The book is of undoubted interest and of great historical value. A useful bibliography appended to the work will enable those who have either the leisure or the inclination to verify the conclusions of the authors, and to appraise at their proper worth the last of the Stuarts.

C. H. MCCARTHY.

The History of England From the Accession of George III to the Close of Pitt's First Administration (1760-1801). By William Hunt, M. A., D. Litt., President of the Royal Historical Society : Longmans, New York, 1905.

This work is the tenth volume of a series of which the first two have been noticed in the pages of the *Bulletin*. Both treat in a very interesting and scholarly manner the earlier epochs of English history. Embracing as it does the conquest from France of both Canada and India, the war of American Independence and the Revolution in France, the present volume is concerned with one of the most momentous epochs of modern history. In its preparation the author has had at his disposal a vast body of literature. Of his manuscript authorities as well as the great mass of secondary sources he appears to have made excellent use. Indeed, it would be difficult for an industrious writer on this period to go far astray in his conclusions. However, while there are evident advantages in sketching the outline of a field that has

been intensively cultivated the effort is not without its difficulties, for the work of such an author must, almost of necessity, suggest some of those more ample narratives. His single volume, for example, will be contrasted with the eight brilliant and philosophical volumes of Lecky. His five brief chapters on the American Revolution will be compared with Trevelyan's four large volumes on a part of the same subject. Uncritical readers may prefer to get from the attractive pages of Macaulay their knowledge of Warren Hastings as well as British India. Those who are indebted to Burke and Carlyle for their knowledge of the French Revolution will be disappointed in the sketch by Mr. Hunt.

It is as a history of England, however, that this work will be and should be appraised. In this view there is little concerning it that need be said. The special student will find in it almost nothing that is new. The author does, it is true, endeavor to emphasize the influence of George III in determining the policy of the government, and he attempts to defend the King from the traditional criticism of his public conduct. Indeed, there was scarcely a measure of the government of which he does not attempt a justification. It is apparent that he has little sympathy with the Whig principles of that era on either side of the Atlantic, and one is inclined to suspect that the author prefers to the methods of the laboratory those of the forum.

C. H. MCCARTHY.

Historical Records and Studies, Vol. V, Part I. New York :
The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1907.

In worth as well as in interest the present volume of *Records and Studies* is not inferior to those which preceded it, and that is saying much. The reader must be very fastidious who can find in it nothing to attract him. From the pen of Ad. F. Baudelier there is a study that should appeal to both anthropologists and archaeologists. This is a result of the author's explorations in 1893 made among "The Indians and Aboriginal Ruins near Chachapoyas in Northern Peru." There is also a valuable study of old New York by Dr. Chas. G. Herbermann, who with his local as well as general knowledge has made an examination of New York's First Directory (1786). This contribution should

be of especial interest to Catholics. A brief but suggestive sketch of Dr. Diego Alvarez Chanca by A. M. Fernandez de Ybarra, M. D. emphasizes one more of the distinguished company who came to America on the second voyage of Columbus.

One of the leading articles is contributed by Rev. Dr. John J. O'Brien on Father Gabriel Richard: educator, statesman and priest. Like many other eminent characters of the past we know concerning the subject of this study only a few meagre facts. These the present generation should know, and Father O'Brien has placed them before the reader in a concise and logical manner. This is an excellent outline which a little labor might enable one to develop into an ample biography. Dr. O'Brien has indicated the method of approaching the subject.

Not so strictly historical in character but of undoubted interest is "Madam Pele's Awe-Inspiring Visit to Kau." Mr. Thos. F. Meehan contributes an appreciative notice of the character and services of Dr. Henry James Anderson. Very useful to the historian is Mr. Cahalan's translation of the Letters of Rev. P. J. De Smet, S. J. These cover the period between January, 1849 and June, 1860.

Archbishop Corrigan's Register of the clergy in the archdiocese of New York (from early missionary times to 1885) has been efficiently edited by Joseph V. Crowne, Ph. D. There is also included an historical sketch of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in the United States, written in 1884 by L. T. Jammé.

A splendid bit of concise historical writing by Dr. Thos. Gaffney Taaffe is entitled *The Crossdrum Chalice*. It affords the reader a vivid glimpse at penal days in Ireland. There is also brief notice of the articles in the "Catholic Encyclopedia" treating of American topics. Enough has been said, it is believed, to indicate the worth of the volume.

C. H. MCCARTHY.

BOOK NOTICES.

A physician, a priest, a poet and his wife, an Anglican clergyman and his daughter, are the *dramatis personæ*, a transatlantic steamer is the scene, and religion and philosophy the "plot," if one may so style it, in a delightful collection of discussions by Dr. Francis Aveling of the Archdiocese of Westminster. The title of the volume, "PHILOSOPHERS OF THE SMOKING-ROOM" (Herder, 1907), carries a suggestion to many priests who have in their day met some, at least, of the prototypes of Father Aveling's "Characters." From the Ethics of Fishing to the Philosophy of Mysticism, from the ephemeral interests of the daily life on board ship to the eternal mystery of the life to come—so, in our experience, as in that of Father Aveling's priest, the topics range. They are handled here with a light, skilful touch. The arguments lose none of their cogency by being set in surroundings apparently unsuitable to serious discussion. We enjoyed the book and we are sure every priest who reads it will enjoy it.

In the second century came the first intellectual clash of paganism with Christianity as a rival philosophy of life. Side by side with the syncretic tendency to put Christianity as a religion on a plane of equality with other "superstitions," there was in the more restricted world of philosophic thinkers an inevitable tendency to judge Christianity as a philosophical system, and to test it by the canons of Stoicism, the only great surviving school of pagan thought. A comparison of Stoicism and Christianity in the second century is, therefore, of more than ordinary interest. A recent work on the subject, "STOIC AND CHRISTIAN IN THE SECOND CENTURY," by Leonard Alston, M.A. (London, Longmans, 1906), while it does not, of course, add to our data, treats those data from a novel point of view. The fundamental diversity between Stoicism and Christianity lay, we are told, not so much in the contents as in the spirit, of their philosophies of life. The optimism, for instance, of Marcus Aurelius and that of the first Christian philosophers, while it is materially the same, is formally different, and the difference is decisive. The Emperor-philosopher does not look for any amelioration in the social order, while the hope of regenerating the mass of mankind is the very life of Christian speculation in ethical matters. Passages from the Stoics in which "Cheerfulness" is inculcated may, the author says, be paralleled by passages in which Christian writers speak of "Charity," "Joy," "Peace." However, there is, he contends, a vast difference in the meaning. The Christians taught many things which the Stoics taught, but they taught them differently.

The recent legislation regarding the reading of prohibited books, the rules of interpretation of the decrees of the Roman Congregations, the

history of the Index, the question of Censorship, the duties of editors and publishers are treated in a very useful manual by Dr. T. Hurley, of the Diocese of Elphin, Ireland. The work, "COMMENTARY ON THE PRESENT INDEX LEGISLATION," (Dublin, Browne and Nolan, 1907), is up to date, well written, well documented, and whenever the author ventures his own opinion in the matter of interpretation he seems to us to adopt a sane and not too rigorous view. An index would add much to the usefulness of the volume as a work of reference.

Of sermon books there seems to be no end. The supply, apparently responds to a demand. And we are, perhaps, not far wrong in surmising that the demand is no longer, as in former days, among the pious laity, but among the clergy. From the point of view of the preacher, a book of sermons is good if it either offers models of what sermons ought to be, or suggests by outlines and synopses the materials for discourses to be written by the preacher himself. Father Kelly of the Diocese of Southwark offers us in his "PRACTICAL PREACHING FOR PRIESTS AND PEOPLE (London, Thos. Baker, 1907), twenty-five sermons on doctrinal subjects, with a synopsis of each sermon. The "sermons" are in our judgment, models of the essay-form, and not of the oration-form. The synopses are, however, uniformly good, and will, we have no doubt, be found useful in the preparation of the materials for the Sunday sermon.

Two additional numbers of Traube's *Quellen u. Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* have come to hand. They are "NOMINA SACRA," *Versuch einer Geschichte der Christlichen Kurzung*, (Munich, 1907), by the late Professor Ludwig Traube, and "FRANCISCUS MODIUS ALS HANDSCHRIFTENFORSCHER" (Munich, 1908), by Dr. Paul Lehmann. Traube's work traces the Abbreviations of the Sacred Names in Greek and Latin manuscripts in a manner that leaves nothing to be desired in the way of completeness and thoroughness. Of special interest are the pages in which he treats of the monogram XPS. Dr. Lehmann's work is a scholarly account of the life and labors of Franciscus Modius (1556-1597), humanist, jurist, and one of the most indefatigable of the sixteenth century students of manuscripts, of whom a contemporary wrote

In studiis Modius nesciit habere modum.

"ANCIENT CATHOLIC HOMES OF SCOTLAND" by Dom Odo Blundell, O.S.B., with Introduction by Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott of Abbotsford (London and New York, Burns and Oates, and Benziger, 1907), is the title of a very interesting collection of sketches. History, scenery, architecture, religion, romance, genealogy and individual portraiture will be found in these pages through which runs the tale of the deeds of Scotsmen in Catholic times and the struggles of their successors in the days of persecution. Memories of Queen Mary, reminiscences of Prince Charlie, and the doings of less distinguished lairds and ladies are gathered from almost inaccessible sources and laid before the reader in a very attractive series of essays. The book is profusely illustrated.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Feast of St. Thomas. On March 7th, the Feast of St. Thomas Aquinas, Patron of the Faculty of Philosophy, was celebrated by a Pontifical Solemn High Mass and Sermon in Divinity Chapel, Caldwell Hall. The celebrant of the Mass was Right Reverend Thomas Augustine Hendrick, Bishop of Cebu, Philippine Islands. The preacher was Reverend James J. Fox, D. D., Lecturer on Ethics at the University.

Albert College Notes. Albert College is making the beginning of what promises to be a comfortably equipped gymnasium. The project of raising funds started with a cordial letter of approval and a generous check from Archbishop O'Connell of Boston.

Every day, now that Spring is beginning, the campus is livened by the figures of the young men in training for the various athletic meets of the coming season. Indoor exercise and outdoor sports are certainly popular with the lay branch of the University.